THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1933. Vol. XXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Underpaid Bishop and the Overpaid Curate.

The tables are turned. In the Victorian age, the socialist curate urged the reduction of the stipends of opulent bishops, but now a socialist bishop is urging the reduction in the stipends of overpaid curates.

It would seem that curates are being so well paid nowadays that they are actually refusing to be elevated to the superior position of beneficed clergy. This does not appear to be due to self-abnegation on their part, but is caused by the fact that a number of incumbents, particularly rural incumbents, are not so well off as are urban and suburban curates. The bishops, whose patronage has steadily increased of late, are to-day experiencing the disconcerting sensation of having their benefices refused by curates.

To have the proud curate replacing the humble curate in this way is simply intolerable. If it be not stopped we shall soon be plunged into ecclesiastical topsyturvydom, and vicars will be refusing to become bishops.

The Bishop of Bradford's remedy for this alarming situation seems hardly as fatherly as we should expect from a father in God, or as socialist as we should anticipate from an adherent to the Labour Party. Dr. Blunt proposes to reduce the stipends of curates. Of course this may mend their manners, and increase their humility, and make them more desirous to be patronized, especially in a rural direction; but when it is realized how very meagre the stipends of most curates are and how narrow are the

conditions amid which they are compelled to live, and the difficulty which they have, should they be married, in maintaining a wife and children, many loyal Churchmen will not regard the Bishop of Bradford's proposal as a sound solution of the problem.

It is quite true that curates, like most other people, are much better paid to-day than they were in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, during which our reformed Church of England has not only permitted the marriage of her clergy, but may even be said to have favoured it. But who would wish to see a young man who it is desirable should be both a 'scholar and a gentleman' paid less than a skilled mechanic?

There are, so it seems to us, several remedies for the difficulties with which the Bishop of Bradford and other bishops find themselves faced.

The most obvious remedy is to proceed with the policy which has been steadily carried out for some years past of raising until they reach a living wage the stipends of the poorer rural benefices.

Secondly, to regard good pastoral work done even in very small rural parishes as entitling the incumbent to promotion to a more important sphere. The usual episcopal custom is to leave good country clergymen in country parishes to stay there for the rest of their natural lives, and only to promote them should they prove troublesome to people of importance or hopelessly incompetent. If a curate feels that when his bishop offers him a small and ill-paid country living that he is being sent into exile, probably for life, and that all hope of any further promotion is at an end, it is only natural (unless he be a saint or a sluggard) that he should decline this form of Irish promotion.

Thirdly, without in any way lowering the personal qualifications and educational standards required for Holy Orders, we would urge that more effort should be made to induce men who have some private means to seek ordination. The Church of England has owed much to many of her clergy in the past who during the greater part, if not during the whole of their ministerial career, have never received from her what is called to-day 'a living wage.' The number of ordinands of this kind

has fallen off very notably of late years. There are of course various reasons for this. The professional and official classes are proportionately much poorer than they were owing to taxation, cost of education, higher standards of living, etc., and they cannot afford to maintain a son for twenty-three years—till he is old enough to be ordained.

Again, the clergyman's office is not so much esteemed as it used to be. In the second half of the nineteenth century to be a clergyman in the Church of England was in popular estimation to be a 'gentleman,' and at least in speech, in manners, and in general culture, he was such. Of more recent years the bishops have ordained a considerable number of men, excellent men no doubt in their zeal and energy and knowledge of the conditions of lower middle-class life, but without the speech, manners and general culture of gentlemen.

The reasons for this episcopal change of policy were various. Some bishops held that it would enable the clergy to win back large masses of the industrial population who had deserted the Church. Other bishops felt that inasmuch as the apostles and many of the Saints of primitive Christendom had been drawn from the labouring and servile classes, that men from our lower English orders should be encouraged, if they had a sense of vocation, to seek ordination. Other bishops again were profoundly influenced by the example of the Roman Catholic Church with its large peasant priesthood. Others, again, being faced with a shortage of curates, were willing to dispense with the usual social qualifications.

It must be confessed, and with regret, that these experiments have not proved a success. Clergymen of this kind have not shown themselves conspicuously successful in the pastoral office, and the ordaining of them has unfortunately done something to check the influx of the older kind of ordinand.

Furthermore, as the result of the breaking down of the old distinctions which separated the world of trade from the professional world, the whole standard of English life has become commercialized, and the desirability and importance of a man's work are estimated by the amount of pecuniary emolument attached to it. Judged by this standard the curate's lot is singularly unattractive. He is never likely to receive a stipend which

will enable him to marry and to bring up and educate a family as well as he himself has been brought up and educated. Moreover, there has been an increasing tendency in Church legislation to deprive the clergy of a good deal of their old independence. And men who are uninfluenced by pecuniary considerations are often distinctly sensitive in the matter of personal freedom and dignity, and are little disposed because they receive a meagre salary to be on that account treated as social inferiors. John Stuart Mill pointed out long ago that men are paid for their services in many ways, and that social consideration and prestige was in the England of his day one of the most important forms of payment made for public service. Men who received this form of payment were often content to forego every form of pecuniary remuneration. Our commercialists and our socialists have done their best to discount this form of payment, and as a consequence it is becoming increasingly difficult to induce the young Englishman to serve in any post, however honourable, where the pecuniary remuneration is small, and gives little prospect of increase.

This being so, another of the remedies which suggests itself, but is by no means easy to secure, is that both the bishops and the laity should do all in their power to show their esteem for their young and subordinate clergy, and at the same time do everything to encourage these younger clergy to render themselves estimable.

We do not think that episcopal suggestions—on the one hand that their stipends should be reduced, or on the other hand that they should be restricted in their freedom of marriage—are calculated to attract young men of the best sort to the ministry, and it is only the best sort that the Church really needs. Perhaps we may note in this connection that men in the lower social orders marry much earlier than in the higher.

Some years ago, when a body of beneficed clergy were complaining of the increasing scarcity of curates, one of their number created a painful silence by remarking, 'There is a very bright side to the present situation—the poor curate is being better paid.'

But now that the poor curate is becoming sufficiently numerous to fill the curacies which are vacant, it looks as though, in

accordance with that economic law of supply and demand, in other words, 'cut-throat competition,' which some of our socialist bishops have told us repeatedly ought not to prevail in the world of commerce and industry, threatens once again to assert itself in the Church.

Hopes and Fears for the Future.

Mr. Nowell Smith, formerly Headmaster of Sherborne School, in an address[1] delivered recently to the West of England branch of the Association of Headmistresses, deals with the present religious situation not in the robustious and somewhat superficial manner of the popular and eloquent ecclesiastic, but in that minor key which a real knowledge of the educated English lay mind must inevitably induce.

Christian, after his contemplation of the varied sights in the House of the Interpreter, is asked by his host: 'Hast thou considered all these things'? To which he replies: 'Yes, and they put me in hope and fear.' It is in a like mood that Mr. Nowell Smith views the varied aspects of our religious situation.

He indicates the changed conditions which confront the Georgian educator in contrast to that which beset his Victorian predecessor. He writes:

> 'The main problem before us as educators *now* is not so much to train up men and women to make the best use of their powers in various ways in a stable world, and to give of their abundance of blessings, whether material or spiritual, to their less fortunate brothers and sisters: but to train up men and women to take an effective, and therefore an intelligent, part in managing, guiding, harmonizing an exceedingly unstable world, in which the old commands of authority and prohibitions of tradition have little power, but in which personal leadership, though infinitely subdivided, has ever more and more importance.'

We, however, are mainly concerned here with Mr. Nowell Smith's treatment of the religious problem in relation to education. In what he writes in the following paragraphs he will be charged with being negative rather than positive, but, if we are to build on secure foundations, a very critical examination of those foundations is a prime necessity.

> 'My difficulty is very shortly this: that the actual system of religion at the present day, both in practice and in theory or teaching, seems to me a very serious hindrance to moral and intellectual sincerity and

[1] *Some Hopes and Fears.* By Nowell Charles Smith, M.A. (Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. Price 1/-.)

> living growth, and I am much troubled by the question, "What ought the attitude of the educator to be in regard to it?" Of course, if the teacher happens to be a convinced believer in some specific creed, the question does not arise. "Woe unto me if I preach not the Gospel." But it is a fact beyond question that an immense number of teachers at the present day, and among these many of the most spiritually alive, the most reverent and religiously-minded, even the most sincere followers of Jesus Christ, do not really believe in any of the systems of organized Christianity or indeed in any form of dogmatic theology at all. I know that eminent and acute apologists maintain that this is due to our ignorance, our superficiality, sentimentalism, impatience of philosophical exertion: and it is easy and natural for them to make many utterances of amateur agnosticism and quasi-philosophy look foolish. But this does not alter these facts: that quite as many thinkers of no less ability reject all dogmatic systems of religion: that most of the great religious teachers have rejected the prevalent orthodoxy of their day, while even those who are persuaded that they are orthodox have been largely engaged in the familiar task of reinterpretation: and that, whether we like it or no, such a change has gradually come over the whole mental outlook of educated men and women that, with comparatively few exceptions, their moral and spiritual life, their consciences and their conduct, are moved by quite other motives than a belief in what used to be spoken of as "the truths of religion" . . . institutional religion with its creeds and its apologetic seems always to be laying a dead hand upon the human spirit, striving to tie it down to beliefs and mental outlook of the past on the plea of loyalty to "the faith once delivered to the saints" . . . And yet—and this is where our difficulty comes—there stands this stately fabric of dogmatic institutional religion, rooted in our own past, inextricably intertwined, as it seems, with most of what we hold most dear, with all the pieties of private, of social, of national life. Few educators in England would wish—even if it were not ridiculously impossible—to make a clean sweep of institutional religion, or to make war upon it, as the French revolutionaries did at the end of the eighteenth century or as the Bolsheviks are doing to-day. It is, as I said, a most perplexing problem.'

But it is this most perplexing problem which has given rise to Modernism. Modernism, in contrast to Traditionalism, refuses to regard faith as a static thing: as something which can be identified with a formula: as something which is always engaged in looking backward: whether for authority or for guidance.

Professor Percy Gardner has expressed exactly what is the function of Modernism in this age, and in so doing he has presented every Christian educator with his educational programme. He writes thus:

> 'Modernism is based upon evolution in science and the critical method in history: and it demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge, and re-stated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age.'

No easy task, but still one which can be accomplished, and if accomplished one which would solve the problem of the relation of education to religion. No understanding Modernist, as Mr. Nowell Smith rightly points out, wishes to sweep away institutional religion; he only desires to make it more effective, and this can only be done when it is clearly recognized that institutional religion is not an end in itself, but a means towards an end, namely, the moral and spiritual evolution of mankind, and that no religious institution can prove effective which is not capable of adaptation to growing needs and new environments. This has to be said many times and in many manners before the conservative defenders of traditionalist institutions understand what the Modernist is saying and at what he aims.

Although Mr. Nowell Smith professes to offer no solution of the religious difficulty in education, yet any thoughtful and sympathetic reader of his address may find the solution both in its spirit and its outlook. He provides the answer to that poignant question put by Renan, the most sympathetic of sceptics. *Entre une religion inintelligente et un matérialisme brutal, âme poétique et pure, où serait ta place?*

Obsolete Creeds and Christian Convictions.

A Frenchman remarked on one occasion: 'I do not put my flag (*mon drapeau*) in my pocket, that is what I do with my pocket-handkerchief.' A Frenchman loves to flaunt his banner and march behind it: an Englishman is half-inclined to conceal his. He is not exactly ashamed of it, but he does not like obtruding it. When it has done its days of service he hangs it in his church, which he visits occasionally on Sunday.

In a very interesting series of articles on 'A Christian's Faith' appearing in the *Spectator* (December 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30), Sir Arnold Wilson compares the Church's official creeds 'to the banners on the walls of our cathedrals, under which men fought of old because they had to fight against foes and for causes now forgotten, but under which they fight no longer.' He writes with the outlook of an English Modernist who feels under no obligation to veil his convictions.

> 'The Church (he declares) has in successive ages revised such formularies, and the time has come for a further revision, for no creed can be more than a milestone. The eye of faith, with widening experi-

> ence, must ever change the horizon of belief. "I have yet many things to say unto you," said Christ to his disciples, "but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth," I look on the Creeds as witnesses to the historical continuity of spiritual development in man, rather than as infallible guides, and recognize them to be expressed in the metaphor and language of the now obsolete thought of the times in which they were composed.'

This declaration of Faith as we regard it, or of heresy as others will doubtless hold it to be, was made in response to the appeal of the Editor of the *Spectator* addressed to a number of distinguished laymen, 'to tell him how much of the Apostles' Creed they in fact believe.'

Yet the Editor has no mind to have his contributors discussing the Virgin Birth and the descent into hell : the Holy Catholic Church : the Communion of Saints and the Resurrection of the Body. These articles of the traditional faith he definitely excludes from the range of discussion. He only wants their views in essentials such as God the Father and Creator : Jesus Christ his only son : the Holy Ghost : the forgiveness of sins and the life everlasting, and on Prayer : which he notes is not mentioned in the creed at all. By this selection and sub-division of the articles of the Apostles' Creed the Editor indicates how far Modernism has penetrated the mind and affected the outlook of educated and reflecting English people who are also professing and practising Christians. A generation ago such a treatment of the Apostles' Creed by any Christian would have been impossible. It would have been said that either we must hold all or reject all, just as we do with the Bible. To regard some articles as true and some as not true : some as essential and some as not essential would have appeared to be as impossible as it would have been perilous. When criticism of the traditional creeds has advanced to this stage, the time and the need for the production of new creeds has come. This is undoubtedly the view of Sir Arnold Wilson who, after asserting his belief in 'the necessity of a creed for a Church as a symbol of union among those in communion with that Church,' declares his preference for a creed very well known to English Modernists and to many others both on the continent and in America, which consists of seven passages taken from the writings of S. John. Of it he writes :

'This Creed is wholly scriptural, and more ancient than our traditional Creeds. It is inclusive and emphasizes those things in the Christian faith which are of supreme value.'

In the same series of articles we observe that Dr. Edwyn Bevan, whose little book, *Christianity*, combined in a remarkable degree brilliant historical exposition with Christian conviction, writes with a fine liberality which would have shocked the Christian world of barely a generation ago:

'Faith is the right response of acceptance and obedience to whatever each man does recognize to be the highest: an atheist who has honestly followed the light, as he saw it, will therefore appear at the Judgment as one who has had faith. A Christian would, of course, hold that anyone with a non-Christian view of the universe failed to recognize large bits of Reality, and that a life based on such an imperfect view was poor, as compared with a life which made the right response to the range of truth embraced in the Christian faith: but he would believe that an atheist or a Buddhist or a Moslem who had made the response of faith to the bit of truth he did recognize would enter into the whole truth in the life to come, and might take precedence of Christians who had seen more truth, but had been less faithful to what they saw.'

Here again we note the advance of the Modernist outlook, and we doubt if there is to-day any educated English Churchman who does not share Dr. Edwyn Bevan's liberality. Yet Dr. Edwyn Bevan's liberality has not got its roots in the facile indifferentism of the sceptic: it is highly significant to note that with his liberality there is combined intensity of Christian conviction. Dr. Edwyn Bevan writes of the second article in the Christian creed:

'I believe myself that any form of religion which discards belief in the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, as God in Man, would be so essentially different from the Christianity which has been an actual fact in history that to call it by the same name would be merely a confusion.'

The question of the sufficiency or the insufficiency of the Apostles' Creed does not seem to trouble Dr. Edwyn Bevan at all. Possibly because, with the Mystic, he seems to regard formularies as quite inadequate to express spiritual reality. Although it is natural for the mystic, and especially the lay mystic, to adopt this non-committal attitude towards our traditional creeds to-day, the practical Christian pastor who has to use them in teaching the young and in expounding them to the old is unable to remain neutral. He cannot, like an Editor, con-

veniently retain some articles of the creed in his expositions and recitations and omit others without raising doubts and difficulties which he would fain avoid.

THE WELSH INNOCENTS.

According to the *Western Mail* and *South Wales News* some perturbation has been caused by the recent diocesan conference elections in Llandaff.

At the Cardiff Ruri-decanal Conference a letter of private instruction, emanating from a clerical source, was issued giving a list of twenty-one names of Anglo-Catholic lay candidates to be elected to the Diocesan Conference, and of these nineteen were subsequently elected. Unfortunately a member who had received the letter of private instructions carelessly dropped it on the floor and it, falling into the hands of one who had not received the private instructions, caused him to feel that he and others like him had been the victims of an Anglo-Catholic plot. As a natural consequence there followed a dramatic exposure in the Welsh press.

Such 'goings on' in ecclesiastical politics seem to be something of a novelty to the innocence of Wales. In England we do these things as a matter of course, but we do not drop our letters of private instructions on the floor to fall into the hands of our opponents. Many loyal English Churchmen are absolutely opposed to the whole system of ecclesiastical elections both in their methods and their results, but under existing circumstances there is little help for it until we return to the primitive apostolic practice by which S. Mathias himself was elected to the apostolate. There ought to be a scheme devised by which the names of all eligible candidates for Church offices are placed in a sufficiently capacious receptacle from which are impartially drawn out the requisite number needful to fill the vacant seats. Some sceptically-minded persons might question whether this method would give full scope for the action of the Holy Spirit in our Church elections. The objection would be a valid one, since the Holy Spirit can only accomplish His will perfectly through the conscious activity of a rational, moral and spiritual personality wholly devoted to God.

But the method proposed would do much to defeat the sinister devices of our ecclesiastical electioneers and caucus mongers.

Towards Christian Unity and Freedom in S. India.

The two following significant letters were published in the *Times* on December 28 and 29, and have been followed by a vigorous correspondence.

Sir,

At the recent session of the Church Assembly the Archbishop of Canterbury called the Church to prayer for those engaged in the attempts to solve the pressing problems of unemployment, disarmament and Indian dis-union, and reminded us that in each the spiritual factor was of primary importance.

We venture, in view of his Grace's appeal, and of the vital connexion betweent a united Church and the last named problem, to call the attention of the Christian public in England to the critical stage which has been reached in the negotiations for Church union in South India, and to ask that prayer may be made throughout the Church at home that the Indian Diocesan Councils which are to meet early in the New Year may give final approval to the proposals.

We would recall that two years ago the assembled Bishops of the Anglican Church at Lambeth in a resolution (No. 40), passed almost unanimously, expressed their strong desire to their brethren in South India that, 'as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated.' Their hope was 'that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches that are His.' And they called 'the Churches of our Communion to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous good will.'

We believe that nothing that has happened since has lessened these expressions of generous good will and of hearty support for the scheme of union on the part of the Bishops who voted for that resolution, while on the other hand there has been growing a more earnest will to unity on the part of the Churches at large. The scheme as proposed carries out the intentions of the Lambeth Conference, and nothing in the scheme in any way goes beyond what is recognised and allowed by the Conference.

We understand that there are some people who are disturbed by the fear that what is proposed is antagonistic to Catholic Church Order. This arises entirely from misconception. The whole purpose of the scheme is to promote the union on the basis of the acceptance of the traditional ministry of the Christian Church. The Lambeth Conference has made quite clear that the purpose is the building up of a Catholic Church, and that the departures from the strict ecclesiastical rule under an emergency are not anything which is not within the competence of the Church to allow, nor will they interfere with the really catholic character of the scheme.

In view of the urgency of the matter, and of the vast importance of the issues at stake, and especially of its bearing on the future prospects

of reunion at home, we would earnestly hope that the Church will be instant in prayer for the speedy inauguration, if God so will, of the proposed United Church of South India.

We are yours faithfully,

E. W. Birmingham.
Percy Blackburn.
Alfred Bradford.
George Bristol.
Henry Chelmsford.
W. Exon.
Lisle Hereford.
A. C. Gloucester.
John Guildford.
Cyril Leicester.
Albert Liverpool.
Guy Manchester.
Thomas Oxon.
Neville Portsmouth.
Arthur Ripon.
Martin Roffen.
Leonard Sheffield.
William Sodor and Man.
W. G. St. Edm. and Ipswich.
Arthur Worcester.

Sir,

There is a very general desire among English Churchmen that, in connexion with the South India reunion movement, the leaders of the whole Indian Church should not be embarrassed further by external criticism, but should be assured of the confidence that their fellow-churchmen have, both in their loyalty to the general lines of the scheme submitted to and approved by the Lambeth Conference, and in their capacity to deal sympathetically and on true Catholic lines with the interim situation before full reunion on an episcopal basis is achieved.

It would have been easy to organize widespread support for the carefully worded permission given by the Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to its members to unite in Communion services with members of other denominations on the occasion of special conferences on the subject of reunion or during meetings of the Joint Committee. But such criticism of this action as has appeared in this country received so scholarly a reply from the Bishop of Gloucester and the eminent persons who signed with him in August last the open letter to the Metropolitan of India as to make such a course unnecessary.

We desire, however, at a time when the welfare of India is so vividly brought before our minds through the meeting of the third Round-Table Conference, to take the opportunity of strengthening the hands of the builders of the Christian Church in India. They can rest assured that their bold enterprise is being followed with sympathy and admiration and constant prayer for its ultimate success by a very large number of their fellow-churchmen in England. We sincerely hope that, quite undeterred by the cross-currents which vex our Church life at home, they may proceed on their adventurous way to their desired goal under the guidance of the Spirit of truth, unity and love.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

P. S. Allen, President of Corpus, Oxford; C. A. Alington, Headmaster of Eton College; Arthur F. Alston, Archdeacon of Hastings; J. B. Atkins, Editor of the *Guardian*; J. T. Barking; F. R. Barry, Canon Lecturer of Liverpool; J. F. Bethune-Baker, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; J. S. Bezzant, Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford; John Birchall, M.P., Member of National Assembly; R. Blakeney, Canon of Peterborough; H. E. D. Blakiston, Principal of Trinity College, Oxford; V. J. K. Brook, Censor, St. Catherine's Society, Oxford; W. M. Browne, Archdeacon

of Rochester; F. C. Burkitt, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

R. J. Campbell, Canon and Chancellor of Chichester; A. J. Carlyle, Canon of Worcester; W. Wilson Cash, General Secretary, Church Missionary Society; Charnwood; C. M. Chavasse, Principal of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford; J. T. Christie, Headmaster of Repton School; Gilbert Coleridge; H. Costley-White, Headmaster of Westminster School; G. G. Coulton, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; W. L. Paige Cox, Archdeacon of Chester; D. H. Crick, Archdeacon of Stoke-on-Trent; Edward Croydon; B. K. Cunningham, Principal of Westcott House, Cambridge.

Darryngton; Percy Dearmer, Canon of Westminster; John Dover; F. W. Dwelly, Dean of Liverpool; W. Moore Ede, Dean of Worcester; J. H. J. Ellison, Rector of St. Michael's, Cornhill, E.C.; Frank Fletcher, Headmaster of Charterhouse; J. Paul S. R. Gibson, Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge; J. Battersby Harford, Canon of Ripon; G. H. Harris, Principal of King William's College, I.M.; F. B. Heiser, Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead; H. W. Hinde, Principal of Oak Hill Theological College; H. St. B. Holland, Archdeacon of Warwick; G. J. Howson, Archdeacon of Warrington; T. Sherwood Hulme; J. W. Hunkin, Archdeacon of Coventry.

W. R. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's; Thomas W. H. Inskip, Member of National Assembly; Geoffrey Jarrow; Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury; W. Guy Johnson, Member of National Assembly; F. O. T. Kingston; W. W. Longford, Rector of Sefton, Liverpool; G. C. L. Lunt, Vicar of Portsea, Hon. Canon of Portsmouth; Hugh Lyon, Headmaster of Rugby School; W. H. Mackean, Canon of Rochester; H. D. A. Major, Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford; R. E. Martin, Member of National Assembly; W. R. Matthews, Dean of Exeter; W. P. G. McCormick, Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; Cecil Middleton; Albert Mitchell, Member of National Assembly; R. A. Mitchell, Dean of Lincoln; W. D. Morrison, Rector of Marylebone; W. E. R. Morrow, Provost of Chelmsford.

W. Foxley Norris, Dean of Westminster; Cyril Norwood, Headmaster of Harow; H. L. Oldham, Member of National Assembly; A. G. Pite, Headmaster of Weymouth College; J. H. B. Plymouth; C. E. Raven, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; J. H. Richards, Archdeacon of Aston; M. R. Ridley, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford; T. Guy Rogers, Rector and Hon. Canon of Birmingham; C. F. Russell, Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School, Crosby; G. F. Saywell, Rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone; Selborne; E. N. Sharpe, Archdeacon of London; Vernon F. Storr, Archdeacon of Westminster; B. H. Streeter, Dean Ireland Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

A. J. Tait, Canon of Peterborough; J. R. S. Taylor, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; G. C. Turner, Headmaster of Marlborough College; E. M. Walker, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford; C. S. Wallas, Principal of St. John's College, Durham; H. G. Warrington; R. Waterfield, Dean of Hereford; E. W. Watson, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford; J. E. C. Welldon, Dean of Durham; A. T. P. Williams, Headmaster of Winchester College; Garfield Williams, Dean of Manchester; Arnold T. Wilson; C. S. Woodward, Canon of Westminster.

The *Church Times*, which is not pleased, points out that certain signatures are conspicuous by their absence from the first of these letters:

> 'Neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor of York, nor the Bishops of the great sees of London, Winchester and Durham, have signed it; nor have the Bishops of Chichester, Southwark and Salisbury.'

The *Church Times* seems to assume that this is due to disagreement with its purpose. Perhaps we may point out that there are many good reasons for these prelates not signing the letter, and it is as needless as it is detrimental to their leadership in the Church to assume that disagreement with the purpose of the letter is the reason for the absence of their signatures.

The next Modern Churchmen's Conference.

The twentieth annual Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held this year in Girton College, Cambridge, from Monday, August 21, to Saturday, August 26. The Conference papers will deal with certain aspects of the much-vexed theme of the Christian Church in the Modern World.

Many to-day are very dissatisfied with the state of the modern world, and others are even more dissatisfied with the part the Christian Church is playing in it. Some of the most seductive suggestions made in Church circles for the improvement of the situation seem to demand serious criticism of a positive kind and drastic clarification of the issues involved. Modernists believe in neither short cuts to success nor in quack remedies, and perhaps Modernists have clearer convictions of the causes of failure than of the means by which a more desirable state of affairs may be achieved. Whilst not without interest in the Church throughout the world, it is to the Church of this land that English Modernists owe their primary duty. Moreover, they believe that what the Church of England becomes in England many other Churches in other lands will be inspired to become also. Our president, the Dean of St. Paul's, we are glad to note, will deliver his opening address on 'The Church of the New Testament.'

There is for Modern Churchmen no more popular location for their Conferences than Girton College, which has been associated with some of the most notable of their gatherings in the past.

The College Buildings have been much enlarged since our last Conference there, and so will be able to receive an even greater number of Conference members than in days gone by. We shall miss familiar faces from the Girton staff who gave us so kind a welcome in former years. And though there be sadness in such memories, we look forward none the less to the pleasure and privilege of meeting once again in Girton College.

THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY

By J. S. Boys Smith, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE second series of Professor A. E. Taylor's recent Gifford Lectures[1] is devoted to a discussion of some of the principal features of the great religions. The features he selects as especially characteristic are those which make these religions more than, or at least different from, philosophical systems, even though each religion may also involve something like a philosophy. In Christianity, the most striking of these features is the significance Christians have ascribed to the course of historical events, and in particular to certain events within the historical order. In his third lecture, entitled 'Religion and the Historical,' Professor Taylor says:

> 'When we examine the *credenda* propounded for acceptance by any of the great positive religions, we find that in every case there are included among them some propositions which are themselves statements about events of the historical order . . . In the creed of orthodox Christianity we see this presence of an historical element in its most pronounced form. Side by side with propositions concerning the eternal divine nature, it contains a number of distinct statements of fact about the life of Jesus Christ, and one definite prophecy of an historical event to occur in the future, a "coming" of Christ to bring the temporal history of humanity to a close.'[2]

He admits, of course, that some of these statements are no longer felt to have the importance once ascribed to them, and

[1] *The Faith of a Moralist; Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of St. Andrew's*, 1926-1928, Series II, Natural Theology and the Positive Religions, London, 1930.

[2] p. 110.

that as statements of historical fact they may in some cases be open to doubt; and he criticizes those who, like Gore, have been ready to discriminate sharply between those statements which the Christian must still accept as literal statements of historical fact (however much more they may be) and those which he may interpret as symbolical. But Professor Taylor's main contention is that the most significant character of Christian belief would disappear if this historical element were omitted and the Christian creed interpreted as a statement in symbolical form of truths in themselves independent of the actual occurrence of certain particular historical events. On the other hand, he is fully aware that the presence of this historical element in Christian belief is the source of the difficulty it presents, no less than of its peculiar character and value. In the presence of this historical element in Christianity, rather than in the enlarged and transformed view of the world given us by the last two or three centuries, he finds the secret of what he describes as 'the now acute *crise du christianisme*.'[3]

Professor Taylor's lectures are important, partly because of their frank recognition that the orthodox Christian scheme as a whole has very serious difficulties to meet, but especially because he has directed attention upon the centre of the problem. I do not think, however, that he has exposed it fully. He represents it as an example of the constant tension which exists between the philosophical attitude, with its desire for general truths unembarrassed by the uncertainties of history, and the attitude of Christian theology, with its emphasis upon the importance of certain actual historical happenings. The implication suggested is that, if it can reasonably be held that the course of events in the historical order has a significance which makes it more than a mere symbol of a reality essentially independent of it, and that certain events within that order may have an outstanding importance in determining what the world means to us, the Christian scheme as summed up in the orthodox creeds will cease to contain more than incidental or subordinate difficulties. Professor Taylor may be quite right in thinking that it is the mark of the greatness of a religion, not of its merely temporary validity, that it makes bold to declare that certain events of

[3] p. 119 n.

supreme importance have happened in time, and that therefore all particular events and individual persons have a worth which many philosophical systems cannot consistently allow them. But this, by itself, is not sufficient to remove the difficulties which now confront Christian theology. There remain the further problems, whether the particular events in question have the supreme significance Christians have believed them to have, and whether the great Christian scheme constructed round them can still claim to be the true interpretation of them and of the world to which they belong. It is necessary to consider more fully the nature of this historical element in Christianity.

Professor Taylor is surely right in asserting that the actual life and death of Jesus, as events which actually took place in time, are essential to the orthodox Christian creed. A denial that they did take place would break that creed to pieces. No doubt, in every age there have been Christians who have not felt this keenly, who have felt more interest in some philosophy of the world independent, as it seemed, of any particular historical event. But they have been the minority, and they are not typical. Much modern liberal or humanitarian Christianity also presents a contrast with the orthodox creed. It found its inspiration in the teaching of Jesus and in his human example. No doubt, it was assumed that Jesus lived, and a suggestion that he did not would have been felt as endangering the truth of Christianity. Yet, for Christianity of this kind, he was not central in the same sense as he had been for the orthodox Christian creed. The emphasis was placed upon his teaching, and his teaching was not about himself—this came to be the point of view. The truth of his teaching was then ultimately independent of him: he was the founder of Christianity, not the centre of its gospel. Throughout the previous centuries the emphasis had been placed elsewhere. 'Jesus Christ is the object of the message, and not its bearer,'[4] wrote Julius Wellhausen in the first of his remarkable series of books on the Gospels. 'The apostolic gospel, which preaches faith in the Christ, is the essential, and not the gospel of Jesus, which prescribes to the Church its ethic . . . the saying attributed to Harnack, "not the Son, but only the Father, belongs in the gospel," is fundamentally false, if it is

[4] *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*, 2 Ausg., Berlin 1911, p. 147.

intended to assert a fact and not merely to express a postulate."[5] Wellhausen was writing of the Apostolic Age; but, on the whole, his words apply as truly to the succeeding Christian centuries. The interest was not primarily in the teaching of Jesus, but in Jesus himself; and in him, not as example, but as Son of God, himself God, made man, and in the effect this union of God and man was held to have upon those who believe in him, and upon the whole world. The point of view is still expressed in the Communion Service of the Church of England in words which do not exaggerate it, though they may interpret it in a way more characteristic of some phases of Christian teaching than of others: 'Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world . . . ' It is clear from such words as these how important the teaching and example of Jesus have been. That God should so have loved the world that he sent his only Son, implies an idea of God and a valuation of the world without which most of the peculiar significance of the Christian Gospel would disappear; and much of this, it can hardly be doubted, was really derived from Jesus—if not merely from his words, at all events from him. Nevertheless, the person of Jesus Christ, not ideas of God and man separable from him, has been the centre of the gospel from the beginning.

Acceptance of the orthodox Christian creed does, therefore, involve acceptance of an event as having actually taken place, of an event in the historical order. The creed says, not irrelevantly, that it happened under Pontius Pilate. This, however, by itself is a very incomplete statement. The event is accepted as historical fact; but it has its place in the creed only because it is significant fact. Neglect its significance for what is beyond it as a particular event, and all its importance disappears. The *mere* fact, if it could still be called a fact, that Jesus lived or died has no significance, and could certainly not be at the centre of any religious conviction. Indeed, the very attempt to distinguish between facts and their significance is altogether mis-

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

guided. Every assertion of the occurrence of an event involves its interpretation; apart from this, the so-called fact would be entirely indeterminate, it would have no meaning. All historical assertion involves an estimate of what is asserted, though the nature of the estimate will vary with the purpose in view. The Christian belief in the life and death of Jesus has been also an estimate of his religious significance. This may be illustrated by considering the familiar distinction between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith. The distinction is misleading. They can be distinguished only in so far as they presuppose different beliefs about what it was that actually happened. The creeds affirm the existence of an historical Jesus—of a Jesus with a certain significance. So too do modern critical enquiries—though they may affirm a Jesus with a different significance. And in each case the interpretation is an interpretation of more than Jesus. It implies a world of beliefs or ideas within which the interpretation of the particular fact forms one element. The same is true of every affirmation of historical fact. To affirm a fact is also to affirm a world to which it belongs, and the meaning of the particular fact is affected by, even if it also affects, this wider world. It was no accident that Liberal Christianity arose at the time when the full shock of historical criticism was felt for the first time. Liberal Christianity believed in a Jesus in some respects different from him in whom orthodox Christianity had believed, and it did so because its background was different. A Christology can never be independent of the more general world of ideas of those who accept it; and the attempt to retain a particular form of Christology, *i.e.* belief in an historical Jesus with a certain kind of significance, is vain when once the appropriate world of ideas has suffered change.

It is here that Professor Taylor's discussion of the historical element in Christianity seems to me seriously defective, at least in so far as it professes to deal with the present problems of Christian belief. The presence of an historical element in Christian theology is not in itself the main source of the problems now most urgent. It does present difficulty, as it always has, in view of the constant desire of thought to find a truth free from the contingencies of the historical. This desire, however, is not stronger now than it was half a century ago; it is probably much

less strong than it was during the early Christian centuries. As Professor Taylor himself urges, in thought as a whole there has recently been a reaction against that type of philosophical tradition—a type represented, for example, by the great movement of British idealism in which F. H. Bradley was the most distinguished figure. Yet this reaction has not brought with it a solution of the difficulties in which Christian theology is involved. The source of these difficulties is rather the interpretation of the historical achieved by Christian theology, an interpretation not in accord with that natural to us. When the conflict between these interpretations became urgent and efforts were made to resolve it, one of them took the form of an attempt to purge Christianity of its connexion with history. The real motive behind this attempt, however, was not a desire to be free from historical connexion as such; it was the desire to preserve the Christian theological scheme from the forces of a new environment. The attempt was not in harmony with the philosophical tendencies of the period. Instead, therefore, of resolving the difficulties inherent in the situation, it deprived Christianity of its traditional connexion with history and at the same time separated it still further from contemporary thought, with which, in its emphasis upon the historical though not in its interpretation of it, it was at this time more in harmony than in perhaps any preceding period in history, at least since the time when its environment ceased to be predominantly Jewish and became Greek. The result has been that, just when the interest of current thought was turning towards the meaning of the historical and contingent, Christian theology, with its traditional emphasis upon their importance, was least able to come to terms with it. The secret, therefore, of what Professor Taylor calls the 'now acute *crise du christianisme*'[5] is not the presence of an historical element in Christianity, but the particular form it has given to its historical element: the secret of the crisis, in fact, is precisely what Professor Taylor says it is not—the transformed view of the world the last two or three centuries have given us. If this is true, it is clear that a solution will not be found in a Christianity unembarrassed by connexion with the contingencies of the historical world: so far he is right. But neither will it be found

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 110n.

in a re-emphasis of the particular interpretation of history contained in the traditional Christian scheme.

The literary and historical criticism of Christian origins, and in particular the criticism of the Bible, is only one, and ultimately not the most important, of the influences which have transformed the background of the Christian creed. The critical movement is one application of a method, one result of a point of view, much more general in its scope. Its effect has been the most immediate and obvious because of the overwhelming influence of the Bible on the growth and form of Christian thought. The Bible has supplied the framework of the Christian interpretation of the world. Not, indeed, entirely the Bible read with the minds of those who first composed its several portions (though these portions were not composed independently, and they do form a unity); but the Bible as authoritative, inerrant, and all-sufficient divine revelation. This was the character it was believed to possess by nearly all Christians through by far the greater part of the nineteen Christian centuries. It was truly for them one book, with one Author, consistent in all its parts. But the fact of most importance is not that this claim was made for it, but that it did not conspicuously fail to satisfy the claim. The Bible was much more than a religious book; it was also a history of the world, and an interpretation of the world. No doubt a great deal of Christian theology came in fact from other sources; but it was not recognized as really from other sources, and it was accommodated within the one great framework. In the end, it became necessary, in order to preserve consistency, to distinguish explicitly between knowledge acquired or able to be acquired by the light of reason and truth knowable only by revelation. Truth acquired by the light of reason and truth attainable only by revelation might indeed overlap; but the method of each was distinct, and since their source was the same it was held that they could not conflict. The framework was strained, but it did not burst asunder. It still contained all that was known, and by containing it profoundly determined its form and meaning. (Later, the possibility of a conflict between philosophical and theological truth was admitted by some; but this marked the decline of scholasticism.) By the time serious Biblical criticism began, this was no longer true. Criticism of

the Bible was not in itself the cause of the change; it was only one example of the pressure of a new framework, wider, more comprehensive, and constructed from discoveries in many fields, as it came to supersede and absorb the old. And in absorbing it, it broke it. Henceforward, the traditional Christian scheme of the world was one of many schemes mankind had formed in the past; it could no longer fulfil its old function of interpreting all that was known, nor, when superseded, could it remain intact. No doubt, it is easy to exaggerate the consistency and continuity of the Biblical scheme as it was accepted through the centuries. It was continually suffering change. At no time has there been a system of Christian doctrine of which it could have been truly said that it was *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*. Perhaps no element in the system ever had been believed strictly *always*, or *everywhere*, or *by all*. Nevertheless, when compared with recent changes, the changes and the variety of earlier days are relatively slight. We, and our immediate predecessors, are the first Christians for whom the Biblical framework, as a world-framework, has not been axiomatic. This, of course, is now familiar; but its importance is not for that reason diminished, nor is its full significance always appreciated. Many attempts to restore or reinterpret Christian doctrine, whether they be conservative or modernist in spirit, fail to take full account of it. To restore the old system intact is impossible; but it is equally true that a mere revision of details is insufficient, and such an attempt tends to be mainly negative. For example, the omission of certain clauses in the ancient creeds, even if it were practicable, would be of little use. Within their original framework these clauses were all significant and credible; if they have ceased to be so, it is because their framework is not now accepted as it was formerly. The metaphor of lightening the ship is a very bad one if used to express a policy for theological reform. Not a simplified but a reconstructed theology is needed; a Christian theology which can be for our day all that the old theology was for its day.

It was within the limits of the ancient Biblical framework, fundamentally historical rather than metaphysical in form, that the Christian experiences, centring round the life of Jesus, were interpreted. Their peculiar significance was partly derived from

that setting, and in any case was interpreted in terms of it. The whole historical order was conceived as a great drama: God's creation of the world, man's fall, a slow preparation through a chosen people with law-giver and prophet, all leading up to the coming of the Son of God to redeem man from his fallen state or from the dominion of evil powers; his coming, death, and resurrection, through which redemption was effected and the purpose of creation completed; the redeemed community of those from every race who believed on him and received his spirit; and finally, still in the future, the great climax of a final judgment in which the historical order will be brought to its close. Even when philosophy was introduced and boldly used to interpret the scheme, I think this outline remained. To us, when we read it, as we can in books still only half a century old, it reads more like mythology than history. But to those who lived within it as the framework of their world, it was no mythology, but an account of the world's actual course, as well as a true interpretation of its meaning. And this was one cause of its supreme greatness. It contained, no doubt, much that was pre-Christian in the date of its origin, and some elements perhaps which were sub-Christian in their value; but the whole was inspired and transfigured by the authentic Christian spirit—the consciousness of a divine grace which sought the salvation of a world which, even when lost, was still its own. No one, I think, can read and understand any of the ancient formulations of this system without being moved by its achievement, and without feeling in how great a degree the achievement was due to this historical element. The events and persons within the world acquired a profound significance, decisions made from hour to hour a profound importance; and this was largely because history was no mere symbol of a reality essentially untouched by it, but a world in which God had dwelt, a world he had sent his Son to save. I am sure Professor Taylor is quite right in emphasizing the importance of this feature of Christian thought, and in regarding it as greatly superior in value and cogency to any view for which theological truth and historical fact are ultimately independent of each other.

The main problem is how Christian theology is to retain this character in a new environment. In particular, since the person

of Jesus has occupied a position of unique importance in the Christian system, the problem is what place he will continue to occupy in the new environment. And it is clear that, because the framework in which we must now interpret him is so radically different from that in which he was interpreted, the kind of significance we find in him will also be different. The attempt so often made to preserve his unique importance by retaining with as little change as possible the classical doctrines about him seems to me likely to have a result quite contrary to what is intended. It leaves him without real connexion with the historical order as now understood, instead of preserving him as the most important event within it. Thus, to take an example, a recent writer insists that 'Jesus Christ is not the product of history in its cumulative development. He stands within its succession; but He entered it from beyond.'[7] In a sense, this has perhaps been the point of view of Christian theology; but only because it was in accord with the manner in which the relation of God to the course of history as a whole was understood. The writer in question has adopted quite a different conception of history; yet he attempts to secure a unique position for Jesus within it by making him an exception. This does not secure the significance Christian thought has given to the course of the historical order; it denies it, by removing from it its most significant event. It is, in fact, a form of the attempt to cut Christianity loose from history, to remove its historical element; and this consequence is only disguised when the reality, which is to be kept immune from the contingencies of time, is inserted arbitrarily into a process in which it can find no place. The historical can only derive significance from Jesus if he is really within it; and on this scheme he ceases to be an event in the historical order. It is impossible for anything to stand within the historical succession, yet not to be a product of its cumulative development. Such a Jesus, intelligible in his former framework, in a new framework has lost his significance.

The same must be said of attempts to limit or control the results of historical enquiry. It may be that some of the verdicts of recent Gospel criticism, such as those now connected with the name of *Formgeschichte*, are extravagant and betray a lack of

[7] L. S. Thornton, *The Incarnate Lord*, London, 1928, p. 164.

real historical sense; many of the detailed conclusions of this critical method will certainly not be permanent. But an answer to them must come from criticism itself, not from dogmatic presuppositions. If we would retain the historical element in Christianity, we must not evade its implications. It is not without significance that the most prominent member of this critical school stands very close to the most prominent theological school in present-day Germany. Barth is not an answer to Bultmann; they are representatives of a single tendency. 'Must we,' asks Hans Lietzmann, who has both these movements in mind, 'be content with the myth of the primitive community and relegate the "historical" Jesus to the region of the unreal, or at least the unattainable? Dogmatic radicalism to-day gladly so concludes, and emotional desire, both outside the Church and within it, has more than once led to the result that men took the difficulty of the task of history for a proof of its impossibility, turned their backs upon hated *Historismus*, and with a sigh of relief entered the fields of pure speculation.'[8] The doctrine of the nothingness of man is a doctrine of the insignificance of history.

Whether, in the end, the Figure of Galilee, and those experiences of his first society, apart from which he would have had no significance for succeeding generations, will retain the unique importance they have so far possessed for Christian theology, we cannot say. The verdict, of course, will not lie merely with historical enquiry. The importance ascribed to him has never been the outcome of historical enquiry alone; it has been a matter of faith. But a faith is not defensible unless it is a faith in what gives deeper meaning to experience as a whole. The historical element in Christianity is not its connexion with an isolated event or movement in the past, to be accepted, if necessary, at the cost of everything besides. It is the faith of Christians that the course of the historical world is the sphere of the divine grace; a grace received most fully through the liberty of the human personality. For what value can the historical possess, if this value is denied to the powers of the human mind?

[8] *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, Bd. i, Berlin und Leipzig, 1932, p. 34.

GALILEO AND HIS RELIGION

By the Rev. W. L. Doughty, B.A., B.D., Minister of the Saltley Methodist Church, Birmingham.

ONE of the most surprising things about Galileo to the modern reader of his life is his loyalty to the organized Church of his day. Post-Renaissance scholar as he was, we should expect to find a mind in revolt against much for which Rome stood. But whatever he thought of its dogmatic system as a whole he appears before us as a very obedient and submissive son of the Papacy as an institution. When his enemies attacked him in 1616, because of his support of the Copernican theory, the only one of their charges which deeply wounded him was that he was a bad Catholic. Writing on this occasion to Curzio Picchena, the friend and secretary of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, he says :

> 'That which I have done my writings will always show . . . and I assert that no saint could have acted with greater reverence or greater zeal for Holy Church.'

In that same year he had a private interview with Pope Paul V, most exacting and jealous of pontiffs, who endeavoured to counteract the calumnies to which Galileo had been subjected, assuring him that he himself was quite convinced of his orthodoxy.

Galileo had two daughters, both of whom he placed at an early age in a Franciscan convent. There they remained, two pathetic prisoners, for life, and during the whole time Galileo showed his practical interest in the little community in many ways. The foundation was desperately poor, and he helped repeatedly with personal gifts of goods and money and pleaded its interests in influential quarters as opportunity arose. He even himself mended the convent clock. Many of the letters of the elder daughter to her father are extant, and they give the impression of a deeply, but not hysterically, religious girl writing to one who understands and sympathizes, because he for the most part shares her spiritual beliefs. Thus, when his troubles were thick around him, she wrote :

> 'I feel comforted, and hope for a prosperous ending with the help of Almighty God, to Whom I cry without ceasing, recommending you to His care with the greatest love and confidence . . . Turn your thoughts to God, and put your trust in Him, Who, like a loving father, never forsakes those who trust in Him unceasingly.'

In most of her letters there is a quiet enthusiasm of spiritual exhortation, couched in the language of the time, but which one feels would not have occurred so regularly unless the writer had known that her own doctrine of God and His grace was in practical agreement with that of her father. Unfortunately Galileo's letters to his daughter have not survived. In all probability they would have shed valuable light upon his religious ideas and experience.

It is with Galileo the mathematician, astronomer and physical scientist that posterity is best acquainted. The conception that most people entertain of him is focussed in the famous words *Eppure si muove*; words certainly apocryphal, for their utterance would have sent him at once to the dungeons of the Inquisition and ultimate death. But that the words express his convictions, even in the moment of his recantation, there can be no doubt; and convictions cannot be annulled by verbal denials or affirmations. It is in what remains of his correspondence that, for the most part, we have to seek an expression of his religious faith, for his books are almost severely practical and scientific, proceeding largely by way of theorem and proof, or of dialogue.

His early education was in Greek, Latin and Logic. We know that he was a youth of outstanding natural ability, with a taste for music and painting. His father was a mathematician, but it was his desire that his son should take up medicine. He therefore kept him from the study of mathematics lest its fascinations should defeat his own ambitions. But in vain, for at the age of nineteen Galileo discovered for himself the world of Geometry, and from that time his way lay clear before him.

We know, however, that Divinity and the dogmas of the Church must have formed part of his early training, for all education was in the hands or under the control, direct or indirect, of the ecclesiastics. He was brought up a devout Catholic and such he remained, apparently, to the end. But he was by nature no controversialist in religious matters, and what exactly his convictions were it is impossible to say. He has abundantly re-

vealed to us the riches of his mind; the same cannot be said of his heart. It may be that he was so immersed in his scientific investigations that the religious side of his nature lay more or less, but by no means entirely, dormant. Or perhaps he was of the company of those gracious souls who have a well of spiritual experience, deep and rich, from which they draw day by day, but of which they rarely speak, and which abides for them outside the sphere of academic discussion.

It was not until the Church commenced her famous attack upon his views that Galileo began to express his own ideas about the religious teaching of the day, and then he confined himself strictly to the points at issue. The chief of these was, of course, the bearing of Holy Scripture upon the new scientific teaching. We are not concerned with the attack of the Church upon Galileo—that is a well-known story—but with his defence so far as it throws light on his religious beliefs and ideas.

Very valuable is a letter written by Galileo to Father Benedetto Castelli, Professor of Mathematics at Pisa, in 1613. Castelli was a keen supporter of Galileo, and had written to him telling him how he had explained and defended the Copernican doctrines, as expounded by Galileo, at the Court of Pisa. Galileo replies to this at considerable length. The crux of the difficulty lay in the dogma of the Inerrancy of the Scriptures. A theory of direct, verbal inspiration was generally held by the orthodox. But if the universe is not geocentric many statements of Holy Scripture cannot be scientifically true. It is clear, for example, that the cosmogony outlined in the Book of Genesis is entirely dependent upon a geocentric conception of the universe. The whole mediaeval conception of Heaven, Earth and Hell takes it for granted. A mental reconstruction of the universe, which was what the acceptance of the Copernican theory involved, involved also a profound modification of many Church dogmas, and incidentally the old dogma of the entire inerrancy of Scripture.

All this involved the formation of a modified and more generous conception of God — God in relation to the inspiration of Holy Writ, God in relation to the whole of creation. It was a big task to face. Well might the tinier ecclesiastical intellects of the day quail before it, and little men of priestly minds resent

that such a task of reconstruction should be thrust upon them. The easiest line was that of vituperation and flat, unreasoning denial, and they took it; and because they were in power, their might, for the time being, prevailed against right. When they did enter the field of controversy it was with, *inter alia*, the following arguments:

> 'Animals, that are capable of motion, have joints and limbs: the earth has neither joints nor limbs, therefore it does not move.
>
> 'The planets, the sun and the fixed stars are all of one substance, that is to say, of the substance of stars; therefore they either move together or stand still together.
>
> 'It is to the last degree unseemly to place among the celestial bodies, which are divine and pure, the earth, which is a sewer full of vile filth.'*

A certain Father Caccini even 'refuted' the new theories, and produced scriptural condemnation of astronomical observations, by preaching from the text, 'Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven?'

The line that Galileo takes in reference to the Scriptures is, on the whole, admirable, and is evidence of that clear, illuminating thought which characterized his life's work. He will accept this dogma: that Scripture cannot err: its decrees are 'absolutely true and inviolable.' *But its interpreters can err.* Adroitly he switches the argument from an Infallible Bible to an Infallible Church. A general doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church had prevailed more or less from very early times. The great Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII, 1073-1085) had declared '*Quod Romana ecclesia numquam erravit nec in perpetuum scriptura testante errabit.*' But where exactly was this seat of infallibility in the Church? The question is too great for discussion here, nor is it entirely relevant, but the General Councils and the Pope are the most obvious possibilities. The dogma of Papal Infallibility was not to be explicit for another 250 years, but from the time of the Council of Nicaea, in 325 A.D., conciliar decrees had been generally considered as divinely inspired and therefore inerrant. But thought on this point was somewhat fluid. It is when you begin clearly and precisely to fix the seat of Infallibility that troubles begin. Even the Council of Trent shrank from declaring explicitly that the decisions of Councils are inspired. Perhaps it is in the nebulosity of the threadbare

*Written by Chiaramonti, Professor of Philosophy, Pisa, 1632.

formula, '*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*,' that the dogma finds its securest entrenchment, but the words are sonorous with a finality that is no finality at all. In regard to this particular question of Biblical interpretation, there were certain ecclesiastics of the day who had, for practical purposes, localized the seat of authority. In a letter written by Monsignor Ciampoli to Galileo in 1615, he states that the opinion in high ecclesiastical circles is that 'the interpretation of the Scripture must be reserved to such professors of theology as are approved by public authority,' but what is meant by 'public authority' he does not say.

There is a letter of Galileo to the Grand Duchess Christina in which much of his theological position is made explicit. He begins by clearly indicating what authority he is prepared to concede to the Pope in matters astronomical. His words have an august sound, but in reality he puts the Pope, in this respect, on the same plane as any other intelligent human being:

> 'As to opinions which are not directly articles of faith, certainly, no man doubts that His Holiness hath always an absolute power of admitting or condemning them; but it is not in the power of any creature to make them to be true or false otherwise than as they are.'

That is to say, what is true is true, whether the Pope admits it or not.

But Galileo had been forced into framing his own views as to the exposition of Scripture, basing them on a quite extensive knowledge of the Psalms and certain of the Fathers. He puts forward what is really a plea for the rights of private judgment, provided it is intelligent judgment. In that respect he followed Luther. ('It belongs to each and every Christian to know and to judge of doctrine.') Galileo insists that if the Biblical cosmogony, expressed or implied, does not accord with the Copernican doctrine, neither does it accord with the Ptolemaic, for long the 'orthodox' view. That is evident to anyone with an even slight acquaintance with the complex and elaborate work of Claudius Ptolemaeus (second century A.D.), *The Great Syntaxis of Astronomy*, or, in its Arabian dress, the *Almagest*. To say that the Bible is in accord with the Ptolemaic System means little more than that both hold the universe to be geocentric.

More generally, Galileo points out that the interpretation of Scripture is not and never has been uniformly literal. God is

described in anthropomorphic terms. If, however, men should be willing to admit the presence of anthropomorphism in the Bible, 'it would be necessary to give God hands and feet and ears, and human and bodily emotions . . . forgetfulness of things past and ignorance of the future.' Such a God cannot be fitted into the scheme of concepts of intelligent men. Whatever God may be like in essence, He must transcend such pitiable limitations as these. The Scripture writers had to 'accommodate themselves to the capacity of the vulgar (unlearned),' and the Scriptures need to be interpreted by the wise. There are passages in the Bible that 'require an interpretation differing from the apparent meaning of the words,' and Galileo believes that this is particularly so in cases of mathematical dispute.

In the same letter he goes on to point out that there are these two emanations from 'the Divine Word': Holy Scripture and Nature. Holy Scripture is 'dictated' (he does not explain in what sense) by the Holy Spirit. Nature is the executrix of God's commands. Scripture has to accommodate itself to 'the common understanding,' but Nature is under no such restraint. She is 'inexorable and immutable,' 'caring not one jot whether her secret reasons and modes of operation be above or below the capacity of men's understanding.' He puts forward the view that,

> 'To accommodate itself to the capacities of rustic and undisciplined men, Scripture has not abstained from veiling in shadow its principal dogmas, attributing to God Himself conditions differing from, and contrary to, the Divine essence.'

He contends that if Scripture had, in all matters, given us the truth 'bare and naked,' it would have failed in its didactic intentions and would have made 'the vulgar' 'more contumacious and difficult of persuasion in the articles concerning their salvation.'

The plea was ingenious. True, it is less objectionable to the Roman Catholic than to the Protestant mind, but it makes strange reading to-day. Does God, then, deceive men into the acceptance of the truths which are necessary for salvation, or secure their assent by an adroit *suppressio veri*? Such teaching suggests that, whilst Galileo entertained a high doctrine of the creative activities of God, he had given less than due thought to

His moral qualities. Galileo insists that there can be, essentially, no contradictions in the Divine Nature, nor, therefore, in any emanations therefrom. Wise expounders should labour to reconcile the seeming contradictions between the inspired Scriptures and the sense-evidenced facts of Nature. That, of course, he leaves to the doctors and theologians of the Church. But he thinks that the Church should forbid her recognized teachers to 'employ passages of Scripture for the purpose of sustaining what our senses or demonstrated proof may manifest to be the contrary.'

Apart from his 'innocent deception' theory, Galileo had approached very nearly to the position of the enlightened Bible student of to-day. Had he been able to give to the minute study of the Bible the concentrated attention that he gave to the starry heavens, he would, in all probability, have stood in the front rank of interpreters of Holy Writ. On the whole, he sees his way clearly. There are certain principles, obvious to the trained mind, which will guide men aright in their approach to Scripture. In one of his letters he quotes a sentence from Cardinal Baronius, as giving the very pith of his own argument: 'The Holy Spirit intended to teach us in the Bible how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go.' He is firmly convinced of the progressive nature of human thought, as a part of the self-revealing process of God. 'Who can set bounds,' he exclaims, 'to the mind of man? Who dares assert that he already knows all that in this universe is knowable?' There speaks the true scientist of every age. That is the modern attitude to which all reasonable men assent, but such teaching was a gage of battle to those Jesuits who were Galileo's keenest antagonists. Galileo contends that the truths necessary for salvation are established and secure from controversy, a statement which points to a private and personal faith simpler than that held nominally by the faithful of his day, and he goes on to plead that these truths should not be added to unnecessarily, especially by persons 'who, though they may be divinely inspired,' yet are 'destitute of the intelligence necessary, not merely to disprove, but to understand, those demonstrations by which scientific conclusions are confirmed.'

In words clear and unmistakeable he lays it down that Holy Writ is concerned only with matters of human salvation, declar-

ing such truths about the spiritual needs and life of man as could be ascertained neither by science nor any other means. That is a very clear doctrine of special revelation for a special purpose. But in regard to truths other than those which need to be directly revealed, he declares that God would not have endowed us with our senses, speech and intellect, if He had not meant us to use them; that it is through them that we learn of matters of an order other than the spiritual, particularly those branches of science which are not mentioned in Scripture. He contends, for example, that if the sacred writers had intended to teach astronomy, they would not have passed over the subject so completely as they have done, not even mentioning the names of all the planets.

Such are the contents of the famous letter, and they imply a conception of Deity which, in the main, commends itself to the modern mind. If a man's conception of God be commensurate with his knowledge of the universe, then Galileo must have had a conception which, in respect of grandeur and creative activity, was second to none. What he thought of the trivialities of current belief we do not know, if, indeed, he thought of them at all. Probably his attitude was one of contemptuously amused tolerance, as when he cast horoscopes for his credulous friends. Where could such a man fit into his mental equipment the current Hagiology, the adoration of relics, the issue of indulgences and pardons? True, the men whose lives revolved round these puerilities were in possession, but Galileo had his tower, his telescopes, the Heavens and the God therein revealed to him. That was his avenue of escape.

Perhaps the most strongly marked quality of soul in any scientist who remains a theist is reverence. In Galileo it was profound. 'I give thanks to God,' he says, 'Who has been pleased to make me the first observer of marvellous things unrevealed to bygone ages.' This was after his discovery of the satellites of Jupiter, and his words were no vain boasting, for, as far as human records indicate, he was

> 'The first that ever burst
> Into that silent sea.'

He must have shared the famous mental and spiritual experience of Kant, an experience which he himself had helped to

render possible for the profound philosopher who was to come after him :

> 'There are two things which fill my soul with holy reverence and ever-growing wonder—the spectacle of the starry sky, that virtually annihilates us as physical beings, and the moral law which raises us to infinite dignity as intelligent agents.'

We know that the God that his astronomical researches revealed to Galileo had deep and intimate meaning for him. For example, in the years when the clouds were gathering, and in that night of agony when he was silenced by the Inquisition and it seemed to him that all his life's work was destined to oblivion, we may glimpse into his soul. There is inevitable bitterness there, but there is also the sense of the personal love of God. Thus his daughter, in words which apparently express his own thoughts, says in one of her letters (1630): 'I know that your lordship knows, better than I do, that tribulation is the touchstone whereon is proved the genuineness of our love of God.' In another letter (1633), she refers to what her father had himself written to her. He had been released after his second examination before the Inquisition, and she says, in reference to this good news: 'You justly say, all our mercies come from God. And though you consider those now received as an answer to my prayers, yet truly they count for little or nothing: but God knows how dearly I love you, and so He hears me. And for this we owe Him the greater thanks.'

Such passages are few and slight, but they seem to indicate a simple faith in a personal God, Who loves, understands and helps. Apparently his private and personal faith was singularly free from dogmatical complications; it was faith in an all-embracing Love that he identified with the God Who spoke so eloquently to him in the far-flung glories of the midnight sky. Did he stay to ask how the identity could be justified? We do not know. Possibly he had not time. Probably all that was involved was a tacit recognition of what is almost axiomatic for those minds that shrink instinctively from anything suggestive of dualism: that there cannot be two Ultimates: that what is ultimate for the religious consciousness must be identical with what is ultimate for the mental processes. He was no subtle theologian, though well versed in the major philosophical systems

of Ancient Greece. In the words of one of his admirers, 'he exalted Plato to the skies,' and, though dissenting from many of the conclusions of Aristotle, he yet had a profound admiration for his genius; but it is inconceivable that the arid scholastic philosophy should have appealed to him, and, unlike his illustrious and ill-starred predecessor, Giordano Bruno, he did not seek to relate his discoveries to the doctrinal and dogmatic teachings of Rome, or to formulate a metaphysic which should reconcile the two. Therein he was wise. He confined himself to the *gravamen* of the Jesuit attack, *viz.* his implied contradiction of the teaching of Scripture. For the rest, he remained a loyal son of the Roman Church, accepting her discipline and her spiritual aids and consolations. Towards the end of his life, in 1638, whilst he was undergoing that sentence of the Church which so grievously and irksomely restricted all his movements, an Inquisitor who had officially visited him wrote to Cardinal Barberini: 'Galileo has entreated me to forward his request for permission to be carried to hear mass at a little church distant twenty paces from his house; this I do accordingly.' The request was granted.

It is pathetic reading. In spite of all he had suffered, Galileo still retained his lifelong belief in the Church as an instrument of God's grace to men. Surely only to a man of very deep and simple piety would that have been possible! It may be that with the passage of the years and the accumulation of sorrows — for his family life was one of continued disappointment and stress — he developed something of that mystical vein of personal religion which appears to be absent in his earlier years. Previous to his astonishing condemnation by Pope Urban VIII, who was a man as intellectually qualified to appreciate Galileo's greatness as his predecessor, Paul V, assuredly was not, that Pope (Urban) had written of Galileo, after an intimate personal knowledge: 'We find in him not only literary distinction, but also the love of piety, and he is strong in those qualities by which pontifical goodwill is easily obtained.'

When the night of his life came it was dark indeed with disappointed hopes. But he had the mystic light within, and it is good to know that. The God Who had come to him in those immense spaces wherein no predecessor had wandered, proved

a God with a personal meaning for him when Galileo needed Him most. Goethe's lines were true of him :

> 'Was von Menschen nicht gewusst
> Oder nicht bedacht,
> Durch das Labyrinth der Brust
> Wandelt bei der Nacht.'

We read how he died on January 8th, 1642, nearly seventy-eight years of age, 'fortified by the last rites of the Church' and (*cachinnare non licet!*) 'the benediction of Pope Urban VIII.'

THE CHRIST CHILD*

'My little children, of whom again I am in travail, till Christ be formed in you.'—*Gal.* iv, 19.*

IN this difficult epistle, S. Paul often uses language which is almost impossible for us to understand. It is full of allegory and strange pictures; in these particular words, he indulges in a violent *tour de force* of language. He likens himself to a woman who has produced children, and is now again in labour with them—not this time that they may be brought to birth, but that Christ may be formed in them, that they may conceive and nourish Christ as a babe within themselves. It is not a bad subject of thought for Advent.

'Till Christ be formed in you.' The figure of speech is taken from a woman with child; I want to develope the metaphor. What happens to such a woman? The child growing within her body governs all her thoughts and conduct—or ought to. Through her that child is going to live; through her it is going to be nourished; for its welfare she must give up much, and must live a careful and healthy life. The child's welfare is more important than her own pleasures, and yet the mother's and the child's welfare are truly identical.

Though to us the simile is a strange one, yet the analogy that it gives between the biological and the spiritual is full of true suggestion. For such a gradual process of the formation of Christ within us is the real and only real aim of Christianity.

* An address delivered at the Church of St. Mary-le-Tower, Ipswich, by Douglas White, M.A., M.D., in Advent, 1932.

The outward circumstances of religion, services, creeds, sacraments, may all be helpful, just as outward conditions may be beneficial to the pregnant woman, but they are only of use in so far as they help towards the healthy and complete formation of the child to be.

Do not think it strange if I press S. Paul's metaphor. The process of human generation, properly regarded, is, from start to finish, a most wonderfully beautiful thing. It starts as an expression of love; and the minute being, thus initiated, partakes, in just half of all its inborn qualities, of the nature of its mother. So there are two points about the process. First the child partakes of the nature and quality of the mother, and secondly the child unborn rules the life-conduct of the mother. These are the two points about which, on the spiritual side, I wish to show that S. Paul's metaphor holds good.

The apostle is writing to grown-ups, not to children. For here too there is a close inter-connection between the biological and the spiritual. It is at the period of adolescence, when boys become men and girls become women—the time when they become potential parents of children—that the religious side of life begins to get a real grip on their developing minds. Up till that time, the youngsters may have been, ought to have been, instructed in the essentials of Christianity; but not till adolescence, usually, does it begin to have an individual meaning for them, for not till then have they arrived at the fulness of an independent personality, standing on their own feet, and plunging into the sea of life. It is then that they are ready to conceive —in a mental sense; that they form an independent conception of what the Christ shall mean to them. They know beforehand something of the story of Christ's life; the story of One who did many beautiful things, said many beautiful things, and suffered many things; but when they grow to manhood or womanhood, some particular thing that He said or did makes its appeal to them, strikes them, grips them; their Christ has begun to be formed within them. But the Christ which they have conceived within them partakes, to a large extent, of their own nature; it is not merely imposed on them from outside. In this it is like the formation of the human embryo. Each one of you has a picture of Christ in your own mind; in your mind, and through

the activity of your own mind, that picture has sprung into being; no two of us have the same picture; yours is not the same as mine, nor any one of yours just like your neighbour's. Yet they are all pictures of Christ, all taken from different angles, and by differently sensitized minds. You have seen Christ one way; I have seen Him another; but if anything about Him has gripped us, then some similitude of Christ has begun to be formed within us. And it is our own particular Christ, not somebody else's, that is going to prove the ruling factor in our spiritual lives. Just as when a friend shows you a photograph of someone you know and love, you may say 'No, that is not as I know him'; or, on the other hand, 'What an excellent picture—yes, and I see an expression that I never noticed; it adds something to my understanding of him.' And so, when you gain a further insight, that is part of the process of the Christ being formed in you. For it is within your own being that your Christ must develope; you must absorb into your own being that which will assist His growth; books about Him, sermons, prayers—everything which may help in your creation. But it must be your conception, your very own, helped on, but not imposed on you by authority from outside. The Church offers to help you, so far as she can, but the Church cannot do your work for you.

The Gospels indeed present us with beautiful pictures of Christ; but they consist of a series of incidents which each of us must weave together to form our own concept. The Gospels do not give us a complete life-history. There are occasional discords. The Gospels themselves are interpretations of Christ's life, rather than shorthand records, and it must be admitted that the four interpretations are not all the same. Yet there is quite enough for each of you to form your own concept of Christ, getting what help you can, from outside, in your work of creation, and allowing the figure of Christ, thus formed, to rule the course of your life.

You see, I am not talking to you of the wonderful event of Christmas Day two thousand years ago in Palestine; not of the manner and detail of the birth of the most wonderful Person in history. I am talking of the rebirth of that character within you; for the Kingdom of God comes not by searching for it outside of yourselves; it is not 'Lo here or Lo there, for the Kingdom

of God is within you.' That is the heart of the Christian religion, that we should develope within us the living power that shall energize our whole personality.

For religion is nothing if not personal. Do you believe that Christ was divine? So do I. Yet if I asked you to define the nature of that divinity, you might all give different answers, and yet all claim the right to call yourselves Christians. For centuries men have argued long and bitterly about the nature of that divinity; in what sense He was the Christ of God. Believe me, and with all reverence I say it, it is far mort important that you should form a true notion of the God of Christ. The object of His life was to tell men about the character of God; that was what He taught in His words and exemplified in His life; we know enough of His thought of God to let His image take shape and assume activity in our minds.

The Church is too often thought of as a factory for the mass-production of Christians who are willing to accept certain statements about Christ. There is no such factory; your own Christ must be generated within your own soul; it begins with a sense of attraction towards the wonderful Character in the Gospels; from that small beginning, the development of that Character must go on within you. The best of Churches can but provide the material by which your Christ can be nourished.

It is a general principle of biology that the latest acquired character dominates the organism; the aim of Christianity is that the spirit of Christ should be latest and dominant.

Once again I would urge on you that the supreme value of Christ to us is that He told us the truth about God; and the reason why we want the indwelling Christ is that we may continually have a grip of that truth. We need Christ because we need the God of Christ.

The real trouble is to-day that men and women do not firmly believe in the God of Christ. If they did, the world would be a very different place from what it is. Without the God of Christ the world must come to grief. It is in a bad way now. But if the spirit of Jesus dwells in us and rules our hearts, there will be a change. 'Oh, be Thou born within my heart, most holy Child divine.'

THE WANING INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCHES

THE churches of all denominations lament a growing indifference—obvious in every section of the community—to religious observances and tenets, and many explanations are offered to account for the fact. The nature of the problem makes it doubtful if any explanation can be wholly adequate. But it will be generally agreed that either (*a*) people are growing indifferent to religion, and therefore to all religious appeal, or (*b*) they are not growing indifferent to religion but that the churches, for some reason, have failed to retain their allegiance.

If the first explanation is the true one, the present writer is unable to say anything likely to be helpful—unless perhaps to suggest that, even so, the second alternative, and its implications, deserve consideration.

Turning to this : it is widely admitted that there are grounds for hesitating, at least, to believe that our people are growing indifferent to religion. For example, there is the number of new cults which have sprung up in recent years, and the eagerness with which disciples flock to their altars. Far more significant is the remarkable growth of a feeling of sympathy with and responsibility for the poor, the weak, and the unfortunate, a new realization that we are, in fact, brothers—members of one another. This and kindred evidence does not indicate a state of mind inimical to religion, and to that extent supports the view that it is to the churches, rather than to religion, that indifference is felt. Indeed, it is recognized by many churchmen and others that a ' humanist philosophy ' is spreading widely among men and women who are as eager to rule their lives by the highest ideals as are the most devout adherents of any church.

Many of those men and women would most earnestly desire, in the pursuit of their ideals and in their practical application thereof, such support as the churches can give to their adherents; but they have felt compelled to disassociate themselves completely from all churches because they are utterly unable to accept much of what the churches define as essential doctrine.

If this doctrine *is* essential, then these people have gone astray; and the churches can do no more than maintain their doctrine and teaching, and hope that, in time, these errant seekers will be led back to see the truth. But if it is the churches that have lagged behind, or gone astray, a quite opposite conclusion is imposed.

Here again are two clear-cut alternatives; and it is urgently necessary to judge rightly between them.

The churches have defended and maintained their position so eloquently that it would be superfluous—and presumptuous—to re-state their case. But perhaps it is permissible to say something of the position of the dissidents.[1]

In the first place, it may be well to correct a very common misapprehension. It is evidently the opinion of many churchmen that the startling discoveries of modern science have shaken men's faith in religion. This is true of some few people, mostly (though not all) of a narrow intelligence. But it is not true of those among the dissidents whose convictions and faith are of any living force. On the contrary, the discoveries of science have deepened and enlarged their conceptions of the Universe and their reverence for its Creator. This is the real effect of modern scientific discovery on such men. And, when they have been compelled to turn away from certain orthodox beliefs and doctrines, it is not primarily because this or that orthodox belief is at variance with this or that scientific theory, but because it—the orthodox belief—traduces a finer and higher conception and is transcended by it.

They recognize that the body of orthodox belief is the fruit of centuries of endeavour by sincere and devout men, often of great ability, striving to grasp Christ's teaching and to interpret it; striving with spiritual fervour—sometimes with inspiration—and with a degree of success that such fervour could not fail to win. But their achievement was moulded and determined by the limitations of knowledge of the age in which they lived. The dissidents believe that this age-long endeavour must never be relaxed; that a living religion must move and grow; that a passive, unquestioning acceptance of tradition is fatal; in a word,

[1] This word is employed throughout as meaning 'Those unable to agree.' It is selected as having no sectarian connotation.

that the spiritual achievement of each age must transcend that of its predecessor. This they believe and maintain, clearly recognizing that their own conceptions suffer from ever-present human and temporal limitations, and will soon, like those of their predecessors, be superseded and transcended.

Most churchmen acknowledge that this growth has gone on throughout the ages; that its results are inherent in church doctrine to-day; that it *must continue*. But, in giving practical expression to their views, they seem strangely timid and hesitant.

It is difficult to avoid contrasting their attitude with that of the scientist, who also (though in another province) is seeking Truth.

The scientist recognizes clearly that most of his theories and beliefs are working hypotheses, not ultimate truth; he looks forward eagerly to their being superseded and transcended. The theologian, though giving verbal allegiance to this spirit, now we see as in a glass darkly, finds it difficult to be actively loyal to it. He is extremely slow to admit that a belief—an article in his creed—has been transcended, or in some cases even contradicted.

The scientist proclaims the truth as he sees it. The theologian proclaims the truth as some venerable ancestor saw it.

The scientist has faith. He knows that the admission of error, with the consequent destruction of a cherished theory, cannot impair the authority of science; on the contrary, such admission of error must ultimately strengthen and enhance its influence. The error only indicates the fallibility of the human mind. For both scientists and theologans the progress into all truth is illustrated by the words inscribed on the tomb of John Henry Newman, '*ex umbris et imaginibus in lucem*' ('Through error and illusion we advance into the light'). The theologian seems to lack this conviction. He fears—so little is his faith in eternal truth—that the admission of an error in his traditional creed, with the consequent subversion of a cherished dogma, would impair the authority of his religion.

But, the dissidents maintain, it is *impossible* to have a vital and compelling faith (which springs from the heart and animates one's whole being) in a creed or conception which is *rejected* by the intellect as incredible or meaningless or irrelevant or de-

grading; and equally impossible to accept as true any conception of the Divine which attributes to Him petty or contemptible or abominable qualities and motives—judged by the highest and purest standards of which we are capable.

It is impossible to have faith in such conceptions; or, rather, it is impossible *except* by the suppression or extinction of our mental and moral faculties. Man is enjoined to serve the Lord with all his heart and all his mind and all his strength; with *all* his faculties, spiritual and intellectual.

An attempt has here been made to indicate one of the causes which contributes to the diminishing authority of the churches. If there be any force in what has been said, it is possible to conceive that, where men have become indifferent to religious observances and tenets, and to religion, they are confusing doctrine, which is ephemeral, with religion, which is eternal. The responsibility may well lie with the churches and their seeming timidity and intellectual insincerity, rather than with any pervading spirit of unbelief or irreligion peculiar to a so-called materialistic age.

GEORGE HOME.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE IN THE GROUPS*

In his new book, Mr. Allen gives an excellent account of his conversion and delivers a message, much of which 'has been learnt in fellowship with other disciples in the Oxford Group Movement.' The story of his conversion is given first in the form of a pleasant allegory and then directly. As a process it follows the usual lines; only the incident of the dressing gown will be of special interest to the religious psychologist. 'Sincerity of mind,' he writes, 'I learnt to treasure at an early age; sincerity of speech and action was for long years inhibited by fear.' His pursuit of truth led him to Karl Barth. At this stage his sincerity and critical acumen appear to have turned on to his own moral life. He found 'a deep-rooted moral conflict,' and 'buried hatreds festered in my heart.' The result was 'the costly warfare of inward sin,' in the course of which it became clear that 'God who was thus powerless was a false God.' In these circumstances he wrote, with another, *Tell John*, where the theme was that 'life must be stripped of its pious shams' so as to allow it to be filled with the Holy Spirit of God. He was then led to associate himself with the Oxford Groups, and after a period of struggle 'the day came when God freed me for His service.' Then came 'immediate release from moral conflicts of long years standing'; he 'set on an entirely new basis one personal relationship,' and was soon 'used by the living Christ to aid other people': 'the temple of his mind' filled 'with love and joy and peace and power.'

* *He That Cometh.* G. F. Allen, M.A. (A. Maclehose & Co.: 1932. Price 5/-.)

In the rest of the book, the writer gives vigorous expression to the convictions to which he has been led. He seems chiefly to be addressing his fellow disciples in the Oxford Group Movement; exhorting, warning and encouraging them. He often gives them shrewd personal counsel, and others may profit by what he says. To Mr. Allen, re-birth is necessary, and the distinction between the once-born religiously and the twice-born unreal. The new life is one of childlike innocence and trust and spontaneity: it is radiant and calm. He breaks forth into idyllic pictures of the new life and the new world. 'The new life combines the beauty of character of an angel, with the clarity of mind of a serpent and the spontaneity of a child.' If doubts arise concerning the reality of this new life, they 'can soon be put to rest.' With gaiety in their hearts, the believers can go to their beds with the greeting 'Good night, fun to-morrow.' 'What might not happen in the world, if the leaders of industry, if politicians at disarmament conferences, if ecclesiastics planning for prayer-book revision or reunion, could go to their rest and go to their labours with this childlike, care-free, hopeful expectancy in their hearts?' The new life requires the complete surrender of a man's life to God. Mr. Allen tells us 'It is evident that man is made to be dependent, not independent.' He does not critically examine this view, and on the page before has written 'God is free with the freedom he has bequeathed to men,' but this view is fundamental to his position, and many subsequent convictions and moral attitudes naturally follow from it. Some readers, conscious of their debt to Von Hugel and Dr. Oman, and unable to agree that this view gives adequate expression to the relationship of God and man, will dissent from Mr. Allen at this point, and should Mr. Allen ever feel guided to modify this view a considerable alteration in his theological outlook may result. He probably owes it to the influence—before his conversion—of Karl Barth, and possibly it is only an earthly vessel in which he has received the heavenly treasure. However, if men are made to be dependent, they need orders, and these are given through the 'intuitional conscience.' The 'morning watch' is advocated both as a means to re-birth and as a norm, for 'if we would hear God's voice, we must give Him times for instruction.' A warning is given. 'There are many people whose morning torpor is not as they think predestined, but is simply the result of hidden fear and sin.' Mr. Allen fully realises the difficulty of a complete surrender, but encourages his readers with the witness: 'When we are thus willing to pay the cost of surrendering all we shall find God amazingly gentle . . . it is as though God . . . gave us the pearl of great price and said we need only pay our lesser pearls on the instalment system.'

In the moral life consequent on this view, man owns nothing, but is to use all he possesses as a steward. Apparently he is—ideally—a steward without any discretion, for God will give guidance for every situation. And so later we read 'Principles of behaviour are at best the signposts which point us to the hidden springs, where we may drink from the living guidance of God.' The writer is not wholly unaware of the resulting danger of antinomianism and in a passage concerning the use of wealth offers a 'guiding principle.'

The most difficult and important surrender is that of a man's pride. The test of this surrender is willingness to confess sins in public. The private confessional is not costly enough. The disease of men's souls, aggravated by the narcotic methods of the Church, needs the emetic of the Groups. At first the confession will be of trivial matters and then men will be led gently to deeper confession. But as 'such deep sharing may be of things which it is a shame to speak in public,' they may be guided to confess to 'some one older individual.' Subsequently a daily confession, before the fellowship, of

the chief sin will suffice, while 'in public witness we shall speak in general terms of those moral conflicts which in us Christ has conquered, in order to give to others the assurance of His power to conquer.' In this interesting discussion of the subject, it is curious no mention should be made of the possibility that hearing our sins may not be agreeable to other people. Though Mr. Allen often speaks of God's gentleness, he also emphasises the anger of God. The word of God must come as a sword 'pricking our silly bubble of pride.' And further, 'as we receive the sword into our own hearts, so also we must then be bold where God bids to take it into our hands, and with it in His name to convict others of sin' (p. 175). The writer realises this is dangerous, but 'it is a far greater responsibility to leave a soul in the greater pain of sin by refusing to use the sword.' So Christ's disciples may be disliked, but 'they must also be prepared, when the Spirit guides, in love's name to out-hate the rest of the world and be hated in return' (p. 179). Mr. Allen advises in some detail how best to convict others of sin, but adds nothing to the technique of the older evangelicals. The book concludes with a chapter on *The Church,* which, we are told, is led by 'elderly Nicodemuses.' The groups are not to compromise their gift by accepting . . . a patronising approval.' These Nicodemuses must learn the need of re-birth. 'We shall,' he writes in a sentence full of charming visions, 'accept approval only from those who share with us their sins.' These spiritual Fascists come to convert the Church—as so many of us do. They discern 'a sick heart,' and are hopeful of success.

We are not, however, concerned here with the probable fortune of this battle against 'spiritual wickedness in high places,' but with Mr. Allen's religion. If it is a militant religion, it is none the worse for that; and like any other really religious person he is most troubled when confronted with what he believes to be false religion. We should be happier if a book which reveals a passionate desire to love his fellow men, also showed more understanding of and sympathy with the variety of spiritual experience. He has, what is essential, sincerity, and the writer's sense of God's presence and power is impressive and infectious. A review cannot do justice to 'the first fine careless rapture' of a devotee, and reduced to 'Mr. Allen's opinions,' the prophetic passion and enthusiasm are lost. Mr. Allen fears that written words will be 'deceptive messengers of their emotional content.' Not, we assure him, in his case. The emotion gets across: it is the meaning that stumbles. Some sentences could clearly be better phrased, some phrases less colourful; and when he takes a dissecting knife to the human soul, his anatomy seems somewhat unscientific. In his rhapsodies, he occasionally mistakes the Garden of Eden for the New Jerusalem, but then pictures of Utopia are matters of notorious disagreement. There is one noteworthy omission. The practical difficulty, which this form of religion presents, is that the believer—owing, Mr. Allen would say, to incomplete surrender—will mistake his own thoughts and desires for the voice of God. Man cannot always afford to wait until a tree is known by its fruits. Should not Mr. Allen have offered more definite counsel on this point, so that the disciple could have had at least some empirical tests of the deliverances of his intuitional conscience? Nor is Mr. Allen aware how easily a man may fall into a desolating disillusionment, in regard to both God and himself, when he begins continually to catch himself out giving the sanction of God to his all too human wishes and opinions.

In general, Mr. Allen's spiritual experience is closely akin to that of the Evangelicals. It is a new bud on an old tree. It has the same exaltation of spirit, the same sense of sin and demand for surrender, the same belief in God's forgiveness and guidance, the same appreciation of public witness

and missionary zeal. There are other similarities, good and bad. It has not perhaps as deep a theology as that proclaimed at Keswick, nor as much moral principle. Possibly both will develop in the Group Movement as their thinking deepens and hardens into formulas: as they are forced to meet criticism, teach the uneducated, and make practical decisions in matters of discipline and organisation.

Meanwhile, it may be unfair to the Groups and Mr. Allen to identify them too closely. The Groups came rather late into the process of Mr. Allen's conversion. There are features in this frank book which suggest that Mr. Allen may not have completed a difficult but definite stage on his pilgrimage. Judging from his account of his earlier life and comparing it with this book, it is clear the conversion has released strong emotional forces, and, as has been noted, they are not yet fully harnessed to the rigorous discipline of thought. He writes at times too vehemently, not to say dogmatically, for a soul at peace. Indeed Mr. Allen confesses the reborn soul will be at first 'anxious, self-conscious, and unable to speak.' This may help us to understand the aggressive violence of some passages—whatever the critic's attitude it is a sign of sin in him—and the number of those of a defensive character. And, further, the pendulum seems to have swung very far in his concern for truth. Mr. Allen regards reason as God's second precious gift, and exhorts believers to use it. Yet he seems entirely absorbed in the use of reason simply as an aid to right conduct. He writes, 'Where reason is the servant of the intuitional conscience, there will come ever greater clarity of mind, discerning why what is right is also reasonable, and discerning how what is reasonable may best be performed.' Here the dominating practical interest is clear—and not inappropriate in a popular book. Many, however, who would agree that truth is ultimately a matter for the 'intuitional conscience,' would insist that a consciousness of what is true is different from a consciousness of what ought to be. In the days when Mr. Allen stood up to a Bishop with the assertion that he would 'only preach realities which God had given' him 'in the form of living personal conviction' (p. 23), surely he was concerned with truths besides true conduct, and with what he deeply believed to be true, or untrue, and was not merely concerned with just what he thought to be reasonable theorising? We rejoice with him that he now cares more for a 'living personal conviction' of what is right, but why drop the pilot? He disparages his past as a mere attempt to enter the Kingdom by amassing knowledge of tradition (p. 82), but he does himself an injustice. It was not just pride in knowledge which moved him but a love of the God who is Truth, and by that sincere devotion he has been led to the God who is Righteousness. We cannot conclude better than with a passage from the end of the story of his conversion. 'All too easily then for joy at the new country which we have been allowed to conquer, we think that we have reached the promised land, when we have only taken a few steps towards it. We check our forward march; we, too, become entrenched in some new position; we stay to build cities in the land which we have conquered, when the living God would have us live in tents, which we may carry forward with us into new lands.' H. G. MULLINER.

MODERN LIGHT ON SEX AND MARRIAGE*

We can recommend this little book of Dr. White's to those who are looking for a general introduction to the questions of sex relations and marriage. Dr. White covers the whole field of modern problems in this connection. He considers the nature of the sex relationship, its influence for

* *Modern Light on Sex and Marriage.* By Douglas White, M.D. (Skeffington: The Modernist Series, 1932. Price 3/6.)

good and evil in family and social life, the question of population, birth control, and divorce, with their attendent problems. Moreover, as we should expect, Dr. White deals with all these problems from a modern standpoint which, while recognizing the value of tradition, is fully aware of the necessity of a changed outlook if they are to be satisfactorily solved.

The subject is so vast that it is impossible within the scope of 130 pages to give more than a brief outline of much that the enquiring reader will feel needs fuller development. At the same time the object of this series is not to give an exhaustive account of the subjects treated, but to present a point of view which will help those of the modern generation who feel that, while many of the old standards are inadequate, there are as yet no new ones to take their place. It is of the essence of this point of view that the whole question of sex should be brought into the light by a sane and healthy understanding which refuses to shirk any of the difficulties.

We agree with Dr. White that the facts of sex should never be hidden or disguised from children, however young. It is undoubtedly true that many of our modern sex difficulties are due to the fact that children have been deceived in this respect in the name of false decency. At the same time we venture to disagree with Dr. White when he says that the facts of sex can be presented to the young child as one of the 'wonderful and lovely things of nature.' We agree that the beginnings of knowledge should be imparted when the first questions are asked. But that is at about three or four years of age with the average child. At this age it is obviously impossible for a child to feel for itself the beauty of the sex relation. Surely it is therefore better for the questions which the child asks to be answered truthfully but at the same time *in as casual a manner as possible*. In this way the discovery will be no more and no less important to the child than any other of the many discoveries it is making at this age.

The chapter on population is in our opinion one of the most useful in the book. Dr. White marshalls his figures in a simple and lucid way. This wider extension of the subject is so often neglected in books of this type, and Dr. White clearly shows its increasing significance for society.

We wish that a bibliography might have been included. R.M.

THE BAD ABBOT OF EVESHAM*

This publication is a collection of studies drawn from original sources and presents many interesting aspects of mediaeval life such as the Bad Abbot of Evesham; the Conversion of William Trumpington, Abbot of St. Albans; William Somerton, Prior of Bynham; the Three Revolts of the Townsmen against the Abbey of St. Albans; the Tragedy of Reginald Pecock; Mediaeval Wills and Chanteries; the Jews in England in Mediaeval Times; and the Taking of Sanctuary.

The mediaeval monasteries enjoyed an accumulation of anomalous privileges which, with other contributory causes, eventually led to their dissolution. They were adorned by the virtues of their humbler members, but stained by the vices of their chief custodians. Such was the monastic system as shown more particularly in the life of the Bad Abbot of Evesham.

Robert Norreys was Abbot of Evesham from 1191 to 1213. Before his elevation to the abbacy of this house he had been successively Treasurer and Prior (acting head) of the famous Abbey of Christ Church, Canterbury, of which Archbishop Baldwin was the nominal Abbot. Norreys was a scholar and a man of letters, but possessed none of those qualities and habits which are associated with ascetic life. His moral delinquency and shameful appro-

**The Bad Abbot of Evesham and other Mediaeval Studies.* By H. P. Palmer, M.A. (Published by Basil Blackwell, Oxford: 1932. Price 4/6.)

priation of the Abbey treasures created such a public scandal in Canterbury that his friend and benefactor, Archbishop Baldwin, obtained his removal by inducing King Richard I to prefer him to the Abbot's chair of Evesham. It would be true of him to say that, in securing ecclesiastical preferment, he entered 'not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbed up some other way.'

Once installed in his new office, Norreys, according to his established principles, laid his rapacious hands upon the wealth of the Abbey and alienated its lands. Whilst he indulged in luxurious living and entertained with regal magnificence, the monks in his charge were reduced to the last extremity of starvation and destitution. Many of them were quite unclothed except for a cowl and a shirt. 'It may be truly asserted that Oliver Twist in the parish workhouse and Smike at Dotheboys Hall were "petted children" when compared with the monks of Evesham.'

The monks had three ways of deposing the Bad Abbot of Evesham—by appealing to the Holy See, or to the Papal Legate in England, or to the Bishop of Worcester. An appeal to Rome was actually defeated owing to Marlberg, the delegated representative of the monks, treacherously entering into a compact with the indicted Norreys, whereby a prohibition order was obtained which prevented the Bishop of Worcester from extending episcopal visitation to the Abbey. In 1195, at the request of the monks, Hubert, Archbishop and Papal Legate, visited the Abbey to enquire into the condition of the monastery and the conduct of its Abbot. He was unable to assert his corrective authority owing to the contradictory statements of the intimidated monks and the defensive arguments of the Abbot. In 1202 Malgere, Bishop of Worcester, after having obtained papal sanction, visited the Abbey but was informed by Marlberg that they preferred to endure the accustomed starvation and flagellations rather than surrender their cherished liberties to episcopal authority. For this defiance of the diocesan's jurisdiction the monks were excommunicated, but appealed against the sentence to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who eventually went to Rome for the help and counsel of the Curia. The result was that a commission was appointed which delegated to the Bishop of Worcester temporary jurisdiction over the Abbey pending the decision of the Pope.

> 'Two years had now elapsed since the Bishop's visitation. They brought with them every kind of litigation, delay, expense, and trouble. The cumbrous ecclesiastical machinery for dealing with such matters creaked and strained and groaned, accomplishing nothing for anyone except the lawyers who advised the litigants. The proceedings in the case of the Bishop and the Abbey are a mediaeval anticipation of those of Jarndyce *v.* Jarndyce in Dickens' *Bleak House*. And even when the parties faced one another before the Pope himself, the same interminable delays and postponements were the despair and ruin of the suitors.'

Abbot Norreys was finally indicted before Nicholas, the Papal Legate, on November 20th, 1214, deprived of his office, and dismissed the Abbey. A measure of clemency was afforded him, and he was appointed the Prior of Penwortham, where he was further guilty of his former excesses and died in 1223.

The Jews appeared in England at the time of the Norman Conquest, before which 'Saxon England had been so primitive as to require few money-lenders.' In England the Jews, as in other European countries, were subjected to cruel persecution in their spiritual and secular relationships.

The Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 decreed that 'manifest usurers should not be admitted to the sacrament of the altar,' and they were further deprived of Christian burial.

They were excluded from society and were compelled to live in royal boroughs or cities in specially allotted areas known as Jewries, where they had their own cemeteries, schools, and synagogues. These Jewish colonies were established in such places as Canterbury, Dunstable, London, Norwich, Oxford, Winchester, and Worcester, practically ostracised from Christian society. A deacon who married a Jewess 'was arraigned before the Council, held at Oxford in 1222, under the presidency of Stephen Langton, the Archbishop. The unfortunate deacon was degraded from his orders and burnt outside the walls of the city.'

The Jews possessed no civil rights and their occupation was restricted to that of banking, brokerage, and money-lending, so that their relationship with the Christian community was that of creditor and debtor—'Shylock, we would have monies.' Loans were granted either on security which, if not redeemed within one year and a day, devolved to the lender as his property absolutely, or, if unsecured, at a special rate of interest which was often excessive and harsh, although in the case of scholars at Oxford twopence in the pound was the maximum rate of interest allowed. During the Crusades much money was raised on mortgages to provide the sinews of war.

From 1192 a registration office was set up in every town where the Jews lived, and its purpose was to keep the deeds and preserve the records of all their transactions, which were at all times subject to official inspection. 'The establishment of registration offices was soon followed by the appointment of Justices of the Jews.'

The unpopularity of the Jews was twofold: they were regarded on the one hand as arch-creditors and on the other as arch-infidels, and in consequence often became the victims of popular persecution.

> 'It is a relief to turn from these horrors to the attempts made both by Henry II and his son, Edward I, to convert the Jews. Henry III established a *Domus Conversorum,* in which Jewish converts were supplied with competent maintenance and trained in the Christian faith. Edward I enlisted the services of the Dominicans or friar preachers to endeavour to hasten conversions. In 1275 the King forbade 'the unbridled licence of usury' and endeavoured to induce the Jews to take up fresh occupations, and even allowed them to lease lands. He might as well have bidden the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots, as expect that the Jews would exchange a business of which they were masters for manual labour.'

In 1290 they were ordered to leave the country, no doubt owing to the fact that the money-lending business had passed into the hands of the Flemish and Italian financiers. Some sixteen thousand men, women, and children, embarked from the Cinque ports, many of whom were inhumanly slain and cast into the sea. Such was the fate of 'the remnant of Jacob' until they returned in happier times.

The custom of 'taking sanctuary' is of Hellenic origin, and was adopted by the Romans, but when the Empire became Christian this privilege became incorporated into the religious system. It afforded protection to fleeing debtors and fugitive criminals, who sought the security of the sanctuary of a church or monastery. In Anglo-Saxon times the protection of sanctuary was granted if the fugitive embraced a wayside cross. The law of sanctuary was not always respected in Anglo-Saxon times, especially when a number of Danes, under the sentence of death, in the reign of King Ethelred took refuge within the walls of the convent of St. Frideswyde, Oxford. The pursuers fired the church, and the Northmen were burnt to death.

The Normans established a distinction between chartered sanctuaries and general sanctuaries; the former was a privilege granted by the Crown for anyone guilty of treason, and the latter by the Church with the countenance of the State for anyone guilty of other crime. Whilst the fugitive was afforded the protection of the sanctuary, the prevention of his or her escape devolved upon that of the tithing-men or petty constables in the case of a village church, and on the civic authorities in the case of the great sanctuary of either a wealthy church or monastery.

> 'Thus the justices on circuit in Cornwall in 1284, finding that a thief called Margery Wolbeter had fled from Helston gaol, gone into the sanctuary of St. Michael's Church, and afterwards "abjured the realm," held that the township was responsible for her escape.'

The bishops and abbots were invested with a sacred character and had power to extend their ecclesiastical jurisdiction in safeguarding the sanctuary law as well as in exercising the prerogative of mercy in the case of a convicted criminal. An example of this is afforded

> '. . . when the Abbot of Battle, travelling with his retinue on the London road, met a malefactor, who had been condemned to death at the Marshalsea Court and was on his way to execution. The Abbot intervened, insisting that one of the privileges belonging to his office enabled him to rescue from death any criminal who crossed his path. His wishes were respected and the culprit was spared. King Edward III and his ministers were greatly incensed by this occurrence, justly considering that it brought the law into contempt. The Abbot, however, laid his charters before Parliament, and had the happiness of being told that he had not exceeded his rights.'

The privilege of sanctuary was modified in the reign of Henry VIII and entirely abolished in that of James I.

J. W. H. NANKIVELL.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS*

The Teaching of Jesus, by Mr. T. W. Manson, now of Mansfield College, Oxford, is described in the Preface as 'a set of studies which are linked together by two main ideas.' The first of these is the importance of Peter's Confession as the turning point of Jesus' ministry; the second is that the key to the contents of Jesus' teaching is the prophetic notion of the Remnant.

Mr. Manson builds upon Professor Streeter's treatment of the Gospel sources; he accepts the 'four-document hypothesis' and the Proto-Luke theory. The latter he takes over without argument (pp. 39*f*), regardless of the fact that Lucan scholars like Professor Creed still find it possible to disagree with the hypothesis of a Proto-Luke. But this does not seriously affect Mr. Manson's conclusions, for all along he treats Q. and L. as independent witnesses. He endeavours to show that in all four sources (Mk., Q., M. and L.) a very profound change takes place in Jesus' teaching and conduct as soon as Peter recognises his Messiahship; and he argues at great length that not only Mk., but also Q., M. and L. exhibit signs that such a change takes place at a definite point in Jesus' ministry. His argument, which depends upon a vast amount of detailed analysis, is too elaborate to be epitomised here; we may perhaps feel that in the case of Q., M. and L. Mr. Manson appears to be over-anxious to press the facts into the mould of his theory; but in the case of Mk. many English scholars will doubtless agree with his main conclusions, although his implicit trust in the historicity of Mk.'s chronological order is somewhat surprising in view of

**The Teaching of Jesus.* By T. W. Manson. (Cambridge University Press. 348 pp. 15/- net.)

the recent advances of the 'Form-criticism' school. The Form-critics have no place in Mr. Manson's arguments or in the index to his book. Thus, according to the argument of this book, there are two well-defined periods in Jesus' ministry: the period of sowing the seed before the incident near Caesarea Philippi, and the period of the reaping of the harvest after it.

> 'The first period is one of announcement: "The Kingdom of God is at hand." The second period is marked by the recognition of the Kingdom by Peter, who perceives in Jesus the promised Messiah. Henceforward the call to men is to come in. Or we may put the matter in terms of the doctrine of the Remnant. Then the second part of the ministry can be regarded as the consolidation of the Remnant, Jesus himself being its founder and leader' (p. 210).

With regard to the second leading idea of the book, that of the Remnant, Mr. Manson thinks that it is the idea of a 'saving,' as distinct from a 'saved,' Remnant that is uppermost in Jesus' mind. Jesus regards his little band as a saving Remnant. This Remnant is to be a 'Suffering Servant'—the Servant which is to save the whole world. Jesus hopes that his disciples will not shrink from his cup of suffering and from the baptism with which he himself is to be baptised in Jerusalem (Mk. x, 32-40), for they with him are the Remnant which shall save by suffering.

> 'Whether the orthodox theories of the Atonement would have been differently framed if Jesus had been crucified between James and John, instead of between two thieves, is a question into which we cannot well enter here. It is sufficient to note that the historical fact appears to be that when Jesus speaks of the sufferings of the Son of Man he means something in which He and His followers should share. That he did in fact suffer alone was due to the failure of his disciples to rise to the claims of the idea of the Son of Man' (p. 232). 'Jesus,' says Mr. Manson, 'identified the Son of Man with the Remnant and the Suffering Servant. "Son of Man" in the Gospels is the final term in a series of conceptions, all of which are found in the Old Testament. These are: the Remnant (Isaiah), the Servant of Jehovah (II Isaiah), the "I" of the Psalms, and the Son of Man (Daniel) . . . Son of Man in the Gospels is another embodiment of the Remnant idea. Jesus' mission is to create the Son of Man' (p. 227).

Mr. Manson contends that Jesus bases his idea of the Son of Man on Daniel, and not on Enoch; for, as he says, it is in Daniel that the figure of the Son of Man is explicitly said to represent the people of the Saints of the Most High (p. 229). But when the disciples flee, and Jesus is crucified alone,

> 'the Son of Man becomes an individual person, not by a process of speculation, but by the logic of facts; not in apocalyptic theory, but in life . . . Standing alone against the world, he (Jesus) is the Remnant. He is the Son of Man because he alone is equal to the claims of the Son of Man ideal. Son of Man and Messiah have become united in one person, his person' (pp. 267 *f.*). Thus, in the teaching of Jesus '"Son of Man" in the present is a name for Jesus plus any who take up the cross and follow him: the "Son of Man" coming in glory and power is the same, Jesus and all who have faithfully followed him, Christ plus those that are Christ's, who suffer with him and are glorified with him' (p. 269).

There is a good deal more in Mr. Manson's book than the working out of these two ideas. There is, for example, the classification of the sayings of Jesus according to the type of audience which he is addressing: disciples (D), the Pharisees (P), or the multitude (G). The letters D, P and G stand respectively for Disciples, Polemical and General (Chapter I and Appendix

I). Much instructive material may thus be drawn from comparing together the methods of Jesus in addressing different kinds of audiences. Again, the sections on the 'reticence of Jesus' (pp. 108*f.*), 'God as Father' (Chapter IV), the 'two ideals of the Remnant' (*i.e.*, those of Ezekiel and II Isaiah, a 'saved' and a 'saving' Remnant) (pp. 230*f.*), and Eschatology (Chapter VIII) may perhaps be singled out as specially worthy of mention.

The style and form of the book are attractive, and the arrangement is clear and orderly. The careful Notes, Appendices and Indices are also helpful. It is an important book, worthy of careful study, in which all readers must find much to interest and enlighten them, and which undoubtedly makes a real contribution to the understanding of the Synoptic Gospels.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM REVISED.

We were glad to print last month a Revised Catechism sanctioned by the Bishop of Birmingham, for use in his Diocese as a basis of teaching. Copies, in leaflet form, may be obtained from the Rev. W. R. Witcomb, 33 Braithwaite Road, Sparkbrook, Birmingham. They are priced 1*d.* each; or 7/6 per hundred.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LAYMAN'S VIEW OF REUNION.

SIR,

Lieut.-Colonel Mozley in your November issue quotes a statement from the *English Church Union Gazette* which suggests that Old Catholics are just Roman Catholics *minus* the Pope. This hardly does justice to their distinctive position.

Their clergy now marry, and the cup is given to the laity (except in Holland, I believe). In the Declaration of Utrecht they reject the infallibility and universal episcopate of the Bishop of Rome, the Immaculate Conception, and the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent. But in any case, inter-communion does not commit us to the full dogmatic position of the Old Catholics. Rather, there is mutual tolerance of divergences, while each Church recognises the other to hold the essentials of the Christian faith.

The *English Church Union Gazette* shows, I venture to suggest, a quite understandable anxiety to assure its readers that the 'pass has not been sold.' If Colonel Mozley had, before its consummation, discussed with Anglo-Catholics this reunion, he would, I think, have found many profoundly suspicious of it. Some I have spoken to would not speak of the Old Catholics as a Church but only as 'a sect,' or 'societies.' According to others they are 'soaked in Modernism' (what better reassurance could Colonel Mozley require?).

The Colonel's experience of an Orthodox Church seems to have been unfortunate. I can only say that in the Orthodox and Armenian Churches I have felt myself to be among truly devout and worshipping congregations —a purely subjective argument, but so is his dislike of the Divine Liturgy as unintelligible to the 'well-meaning, undogmatic Englishman.' Admittedly these ancient churches are not abreast of us in modern thought. But most of them have only recently emerged from the repressive rule of Islam—some, indeed, are still under it. They are conservative, but not hostile to Reformed Christendom. Their representatives attend Stockholm, Lausanne and Lambeth. Their students are being influenced by the S.C.M. Their leaders deserve sympathy and not prejudice from us in their brave efforts to end the isolation of many centuries.

Only a sense of their need of one another seems capable of inspiring a real passion for reunion among differing Christians. The continued advance

of materialism may prove the very thing for healing our home divisions. This will certainly come when the people on both sides desire it sufficiently. Meanwhile, I would plead with the Colonel's 'well-meaning, undogmatic Englishman' not to be irritated at the other fellow's point of view because he does not understand it.

ERNEST H. TUTT, A.K.C.

Bishop's College,
Cheshunt, Herts.

SIR,

I am afraid that Mr. Tutt in his well-meaning letter avoids the main point of my article. Briefly that point was that if we are to have intercommunion with other Catholics and with the Eastern Church we should equally have it with our English nonconformist Churches. My article was a suggestion of a constructive policy, not a criticism. That Christians, although one in the great fundamentals of the Christian faith, should differ on many minor issues, whether of doctrine, organization or worship, is inevitable. But such differences appear to me to be no reason why we should not meet each other at the Lord's Table.

E. N. MOZLEY.

5 Holly Bank, Headingley, Leeds.
December 17th, 1932.

'THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS SEEN BY A FORMER ROMAN CATHOLIC.'

SIR,

With regard to my article, headed as above, in your January number, may I add the following remarks?

I have received from a well-known and able Evangelical leader a letter expressing the view that in the article I hardly did justice to the position of Conservative Evangelicals. My esteemed correspondent adds:—

> 'No Conservative Evangelical regards the existing standards and practices of the Church of England in the Book of Common Prayer as incapable of adjustment to new knowledge and light. The defect in your article is that you hardly even allude to the place given in the Articles and Book of Common Prayer to the authority of the Holy Scripture. I cannot now go more fully into it, but if you will yourself read the Articles you will find this cardinal principle everywhere asserted and with it a very frank and full declaration that upon some matters adjustment and corrections may be made when shown to be necessary; but Protestants put up against a supposed Infallible Pope and Church, an Infallible Christ of Whom the Holy Scriptures are the sole and final revelation.'

My article was concerned more with the advanced Anglo-Catholic Party than with the Evangelical, but I have pleasure in making use of the above excellent brief statement of the position of the Evangelical party, since I do not want to seem unjust. Certain questions as to the nature of Biblical inspiration are implied in the statement, but it is needless for me to go into them. Very able statements of the Evangelical view on those matters are to be found at pages 87-8 and 331-2 of the new edition of *The Protestant Dictionary*, just published by the Harrison Trust, London.

Highbury, London, N.5.

J. W. POYNTER.

December 29th, 1932.

FEATURED SINNERS.

SIR,

I am surprised and pained at the unfair way in which Mr. A. J. Russell's book, *For Sinners Only*, has been reviewed in your November issue. The

reviewer's criticisms are negative and superficial where they do not completely miss the point; and he has made not the slightest attempt to understand the purpose of the book or to perceive the value it certainly contains for many people.

I have, however, no wish to argue the matter. Undoubtedly, minds clearer and abler than mine will do this. I can only say that I am constantly meeting people who really are trying to follow Christ, either because they have encountered the Groups or because they have read Mr. Russell's book.

The Groups constitute 'Christianity in action,' and they are surely one of the most hopeful and inspiring things in our midst at the present time. Through them God has given a new realisation of His Purposes to many who had almost forgotten His very existence.

Holmbury, Keston, Kent.
November 28th, 1932.

REGINALD G. JACKSON.

SIR,

B.B.C. RELIGIOUS LECTURES.

Most of the parochial clergy have probably already considered what use they can make in their parishes, for the purpose of religious education, of the series of lectures on 'God and the World' to be broadcast on alternate Sunday evenings during this year. There is one field of glorious opportunity to which attention should be drawn in this connection, namely, the senior boys and girls of our schools, and especially of boarding schools. The Heads of these would probably welcome the opportunity of gathering together such pupils as would be interested to listen to the addresses and to discuss them afterwards, either with some members of the staff, or, if one is available, with a local clergyman of the right kind. Here is a chance for modernist clergy.

The suggestion is applicable also to training and other Colleges. The interest in religious discussion which will be stirred up by the addresses should be used by Modern Churchmen to the fullest possible extent.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

The Church House, Westminster,
London, S.W.1.
January 9th, 1933.

T. J. WOOD.

SIR,

ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

The growing interest in the study of Divinity has led to the formation, under the auspices of the Divinity Lectures Committee, of this interdenominational Association, whose aim will be to promote work of a University type and standard in the study of the Bible and kindred subjects, and to assist those engaged in the teaching profession and other to keep abreast of the results of modern Biblical study. That this more advanced study, generally only obtainable by theological students, meets a real need among the more educated members of the general public to-day, is shown by the rapid increase throughout the country of University Extra-mural classes on religious subjects and by the kind of students to be found in such classes.

Experience shows that those engaged in the responsible work of training young people, whether in the capacity of parents or school-teachers, welcome with enthusiasm the help of modern biblical study, and that where Local Education Authorities or Universities have provided courses of lectures on the Bible on modern lines those who have attended them have greatly appreciated the wider outlook and inspiration they have received.

It has been found that classes are particularly successful when associated with the Extra-mural work of the Universities. The name 'University' in a University Extension or University Tutorial class on religious subjects, assures an absence of bias and the same intellectual standard as that to which the general public is already accustomed in other subjects.

The Association for Adult Religious Education could, by co-operation with Universities, Education Authorities and Theological Colleges, in many cases suggest suitable lecturers acquainted with the results of modern knowledge, and trained to put this material in an attractive form. In recent years courses of lectures have been given by such scholars as Professor C. H. Dodd, Dean Inge and the Bishop of Plymouth in various parts of the country.

In those districts where lectures could not be arranged, it would be the aim of the Association to put members who desired it into touch with some scholar or scholars of University standing who would offer guidance and help in the selection of books for private study, or give lessons by correspondence, where desired, on terms to be mutually arranged. Literature of a helpful kind might also be disseminated and members could be afforded the chance of personal intercourse with those who shared their interests at a conference on the work of Adult Religious Education every year.

All in sympathy with these aims are asked to send their names and addresses with a minimum subscription of 1/- (kindly note stamps *not* accepted) to Miss Hilda Dott, 'Ashbourne,' Lawrie Park Road, Sydenham, London, S.E.26.

It would greatly help the Association if members would also send the names and addresses of other persons likely to be interested.

Additional donations of 2/6, 5/-, 10/- and upwards will also be gratefully received to promote the aims of the Association.

A. E. GARVIE, Principal of New College, Hampstead,
V. F. STORR, Archdeacon of Westminster,
Presidents of the Association.
A. S. BARRATT, Headmistress of Clapham High School for Girls.
A. W. HARRISON, Principal of Westminster Training College.
R. B. HENDERSON, Headmaster of Alleyn's School, Dulwich.
M. H. MOORE, Headmistress of Chaucer School, Southwark.
S. E. S. RICHARDS, Principal of Stockwell Training College.
M. S. WEST, *Hon. Organising Secretary of the Association.*

REVIEWING.

SIR,

Obviously a review's first business is not merely to give, but to give as positively and emphatically as possible, an author's main contention and thought. Criticism, necessary enough, is secondary. My experience is that with the exception of the *Modern Churchman* too often it is the other way about. Consequently it does not send the public to look for the theme, injustice is done to the author and worst of all, a valuable contribution to truth may in these days of many books miss publication. I often find this so even of great books. Two such, by the way, have not been reviewed by the *Modern Churchman*.

Oman's *Natural and Supernatural*, 1931, is to my mind one of, if not the greatest of, modern works on the subject, and one the clergy should master. In contrast with nineteenth century science's explanation by origins it shows the prophetical way to be ever to explain matters rather by what we see beyond where we are than by what is behind us, which indeed science is now coming more and more to do; all knowledge, all

conscience and all revelation being in a sense historical, coming from the continual reaching out to a larger environment.

Such reviews as I have seen miss this but take care not to miss criticism of the book's individualism or other supposed error.

Then Lippman's *Preface to Morals* offers in language extraordinarily limpid and trenchant the most satisfying way to my mind out of the tangle of obsolete sanctions for morality, really bringing us back, not to sanctions at all, but to the broad principles of Christ. For such in effect is to be inferred from this Preface's interpretation of modern moral experience. Thus in the chapter 'Love in the Great Society': 'It is in the hidden issues between lovers, more than anywhere else, that men and women are compelled by personal anguish rather than by laws and preachments or even by abstract philosophy to transcend naïve desire and to reach out towards a mature and disinterested partnership with their world.'

Here again reviews mostly fix upon some weakness or other, such as 'it relies too much on intellectual solvents,' which to my thinking, by the way, would take some showing. So they fail to emphasize the book's immensely valuable counsel to the moralist in his present incredibly difficult problem.

C. I. RADFORD.

Shipley Vicarage,
Horsham, Sussex.
December 29th, 1932.

THE NEW RIPON HALL.

To our Readers.

I am including as an inset in this issue of the *Modern Churchman* the first subscription list of gifts and promises made to the new Ripon Hall from October 1 to December 31, 1932.

Should there be any omission or inaccuracy in the figures I should be greatly obliged if you would kindly inform me at once, so that immediate correction can be made. It is intended to publish our second subscription list in the April *Modern Churchman*. This second subscription list will be closed on March 31, 1933. The total of sums given or promised in our first list amounts to £2,732 16*s*. 2*d*.

We venture to call the attention of our readers to the fact that the sum of at least £5000 is imperatively required to meet the necessities of reconstruction and removal to our new Ripon Hall in July, 1933.

How much a properly equipped and adequately staffed theological college, true to our principles, may mean for our cause and the future influence of the Church of England, is not easily measured. Such a foundation may go much further towards the practical solution of our ecclesiastical problems and the promotion of that better state of things in our Church which we all desire, than any other form of self-sacrificing activity in Church affairs to which Modernists can devote themselves at the present time.

Should any of our readers have been unable to subscribe hitherto I shall be grateful to receive their promises or donations for our second list. All promises and donations should be sent to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Oxford. Subscriptions, however small, are gratefully received and promised donations may be paid by instalments within a period extending over three years.

I wish to thank very heartily those who in such difficult financial times have promptly come forward with most encouraging and generous offers of support.

HENRY D. A. MAJOR.

Ripon Hall, Oxford,
New Year's Day, 1933.